

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. IV.

List of Contributors to Volume IV.

REV. J. BARMBY, M.A.
REV. W. E. BARNES, B.D.
REV. THOMAS BARNES, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. H. BENNETT, M.A.
REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
REV. HENRY BURTON, M.A.
F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.
THE LATE REV. R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D.
SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., F.R.S.
REV. JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., LL.D.
REV. E. H. GIFFORD, D.D.
REV. W. R. INGE, M.A.
REV. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.
REV. PROF. E. KÖNIG, D.D.
PROF. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A.
REV. E. MEDLEY, B.A.
REV. W. W. PEYTON, M.A.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. D. M. ROSS, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D.
S. SCHECHTER, M.A.
REV. PROF. E. SCHÜRER, D.D.
REV. PROF. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D.
REV. JOHN THOMAS, M.A.
JULIA WEDGWOOD.
REV. PREB. B. WHITEFOORD, M.A.
REV. R. WINTERBOTHAM, M.A.
REV. WILLIAM WRIGHT, D.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume IV.



London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCVI.

ser. 5

v. 4

1896; 2

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND, LONDON.

1903-

A FRAGMENT OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

THERE is no need to dilate in this Review on the importance of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus. As every student of the Bible knows, the older Sirach wrote his Wisdom in the Hebrew language, but unfortunately the original has long ago disappeared, whilst the best versions of it—as such are usually considered the Greek, the Syriac, and the Vetus Latina, from which all the later renderings are derived—are in a very unsatisfactory state, owing chiefly to imperfect acquaintance on the part of the translators with the Hebrew language. Thus it is only the restoration of the Original which would give us back the real Sirach. The readers of the EXPOSITOR, who still remember the controversy between Prof. Margoliouth and Professors Cheyne, Driver and Nöldeke in this Review,¹ know also how decisive a fact such a restoration would form in the questions which are now exciting every Bible student. For instance, if it could be proved that Sirach, who flourished about 200 B.C., composed his work, as some believe, in the Rabbinic idiom, with which we are acquainted from the Talmudic literature, “then between Ecclesiasticus and the books of the Old Testament there must lie centuries, nay, there must lie, in most cases, the deep waters of the Captivity, the grave of the Old-Hebrew and the old Israel, and the womb of the New-Hebrew and the new Israel.” The assumption of Maccabæan Psalms, and many another hypothesis of Bible-Criticism would fall to the ground.

¹ See EXPOSITOR, 1890, I., 295–320, 381–391; and II., 350–358.

It is more important, perhaps, to point here to the evidence as to the existence of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew afforded by Rabbinic literature both before Jerome, who declares that he has seen the book in the Hebrew original, as well as for nearly six centuries after the death of this father of the Church. For brevity's sake it will be sufficient to refer here to the articles by Dr. Neubauer and by myself in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, in which all the quotations from Sirach to be found in Rabbinic literature are collected.¹ From these it will be seen that these quotations extend over a period of more than a thousand years, viz., from Simeon b. Shetach, who flourished about 70 B.C., to the Gaon R. Saadyah, who died in 949 A.C. The evidence of the latter is the more interesting, as we learn from him something about the actual state of the book, which was still in circulation in his time. I am referring to the Gaon's introduction to the *Sepher Haggalui*, in which we have the following statements.² Speaking there of the Sages who, coming after the discontinuance of prophecy, composed books of instruction and wisdom for the use of posterity, he says: "As we find that Simeon, the son of Joshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sirach, had composed a book of Instruction which is similar to the book of Proverbs in its sections and verses, and which he provided with vowels and accents. And as Eleazar, the son of Irai, who composed a book of Wisdom which is like the book of Ecclesiastes both in its order and its

¹ Dr. Neubauer's article, "Hebrew Sentences in Eccclus.," appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, IV. pp. 162-164, whilst mine was published in the same Review (III., pp. 682-706), under the title "The Quotations from Eccclus. in Rabbinic Literature." I may add here that I have both before and since then collected many materials on echoes of Sirach in the Rabbinic literature and the Jewish liturgy which, though not given in the name of Sirach (as the Quotations are), throw much light on many an obscure passage in Eccclus.

² The quotations in the text are given from Dr. Harkavy's זכרון לראשונים, V., in which the fragments of the ספר הנלי appeared.

verses, and is provided with vowels and accents."¹ A few pages further on, where he defends himself against the attacks of the Caraites, he says: "And when these wicked people saw that I had composed a book in Hebrew, divided into verses and provided with vowels and accents, they denounced me with mean slander, and said that this is pretension to prophecy" (that is, they accused him of the ambition to imitate the Scriptures). . . . "But this is only their folly, . . . for these things (the dividing of a Hebrew book into verses and providing it with vowels and accents) any man can do, as, indeed, Ben Sira did, Ben Iri, the sons of the Hasmonæans, and the Bene Africa, but none of them pretended to prophecy";² whilst about the end of this Introduction we read, "As indeed the sages made use of the book of Ben Sira, and took from him beautiful words of instruction and meditation,"³ after which he proceeds to give seven sayings from Sirach, which are all to be found in our Ecclesiasticus, and three from the Book of Wisdom (Eleazar) ben Irai.⁴

Having thus the established fact that the book of Ecclesiasticus was still circulated in *Hebrew* among the Jews in the 10th century,⁵ I will now proceed to the description and reproduction of the Fragment of Sirach, which is the main object of this paper. But before doing so, it

¹ Harkavy, *Ibid.*, p. 150. In the Appendix, p. 200, Harkavy shows that we ought to read Joshua, the son of Simon, etc.

² Harkavy, *Ibid.*, p. 162.

³ Harkavy, *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁴ This Eleazar is otherwise unknown. It is an interesting fact that one of the quotations Saadyah gives from his Wisdom is to be found in Ecclus. iii. 20, 21, and is also quoted in the Talmud, in the name of Sirach. Cp. my Quotations (as above), No. 4.

⁵ As I hope to show at some future time, there is a strong probability that also the Gaon R. Hai (who died 1038) made use of Sirach in his *מוסר השכל*, though he does not mention him. The quotations in the *משעשע תורה* and *בריייתא דכלה* (cf. Prof. Margoliouth, *Expositon*, 1890, I., p. 306, No. 14, and my Quotations, as above, Nos. 21 and 23), belong probably also to the 11th century.

is my pleasant duty to record here my deepest gratitude to Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, who, being themselves Semitic scholars, and more than generous to fellow-students, have always placed at my disposal their invaluable treasures of Hebrew MSS., allowing me not only to study them, but also to make use of them for publication.

For this Fragment we are indebted to their last journey in Palestine and Egypt, in which countries they have acquired various Hebrew MSS., mostly in fragments. Our Fragment was found in the Palestine bundle, among other leaves of Hebrew MSS., extending over various branches of Jewish literature, as Bible, Mishnah, Talmud, Liturgy, Grammar, etc. The Fragment forms one leaf, and measures $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $7\frac{3}{4}$ inches. The writing is in two columns, hanging from the lines, which is a proof of an early date. The verses read *across* the lines, each column giving half a verse.¹ The number of the lines on each side is seventeen. Although the leaf is torn at the foot, I am able to judge, by comparing the lowest extant line of the recto with the top line of the verso, that one line only is missing.

As to the writing, it represents the so-called Syriac square character of an early type; certainly not later than the beginning of the 12th century. The MS. has also various marginal glosses, all of which, except one, present the same character, though, as it seems to me, by a somewhat later hand. These glosses give varying readings, probably from some other MS., which proves that the Hebrew of Sirach was then still existing in more than one copy. The MS. has, however, suffered terribly by age. The edges are so badly mutilated that they are almost entirely gone, only some few letters remaining. Some lines also in the middle

¹ The end of the verse is marked by two dots, but they are faded in some places.

of the page are entirely eaten away; either the surface of the paper being gone, or the ink faded or run together, so that the letters cannot be made out with any certainty even with the aid of chemicals. In the text that follows, such places are indicated by dots. Letters supplied to words only partly legible are enclosed in square brackets, whilst such words of the reading as are doubtful, are marked by a query. The marginal readings are also given here on the margin in smaller type.

The Fragment corresponds with chh. XXXIX. 15 ins.-XL. 6 (R.V., pica, demy 8vo, p. 318, 2nd line from the top, to p. 320, 13th line from the top), and runs as on pages 6 and 7.

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

1. **מינים**]. The *plena* writing (as indicating the chirek) just before a letter provided with a *dagesh* is very common with a certain school of copyists. Cf. Rapoport, *Bikkure Haitim*, x. p. 104. The beginning of the verse had probably **בְּקוֹל בְּתֵרוּעָה** cf. Job viii. 21, **הַרְעָה וּשְׁפָתֶיךָ**, which probably suggested the Greek (xxxix. 15) ἐν φθαῖς χειλέων. On the whole our text in this verse shows more agreement with the Greek than with the Syriac.

2. **כלם**]. The marginal reading, which is indicated by the ring-mark over the word, is faded, but we may safely supply it after v. 23 by **הַכֵּל**, and so we may, after the same parallel, supply **מַעֲשֵׂה** at the beginning of the verse. **יִסְפֹּק**. Parallel in v. 23, **יִסְפֹּק**. Cf. 1 Kings xx. 10. For the *hiphil*, see Isaiah ii. 7. The spelling with **ס** (instead of **שׁ**) occurs in Job xx. 22, and is almost the rule in Rabbinic literature. In this latter the *hiphil* (and also the *piel*) is used either in the sense of supplying needs (cf. *Mechilta* to Exod. xvii. 7, **לָנוּ כָּל צָרָתֵנוּ** [or **מַסְפֵּק**] **אִם מַסְפֵּק**) or in that of proving sufficient. We may accordingly translate this clause either that the **מַעֲשֵׂה** or **אֵל** will supply every need, or the **מַעֲשֵׂה** will prove sufficient for every need or emergency. The latter, which admits of the *kal*, and is nearer to the sense in which the word is also used in the Bible, is more probable.

3. Supply **אֵין לְאִישׁ**. The clause would then read (accepting also the letters supplied in the text marked by the square brackets), *It is not for man to estimate their value.* **מוֹצֵא פִּיו**]. Cf. Deut. viii. 5. There is still a very faint sign of a letter before the **מ** of **מוֹצֵא**, which may be

Recto.

וכן תאמר בתרועה:	1 רינה (?) ונבל ועלי מיני[ם]
וכל צורך בעתו יספיק:	2 אל כלם מובים
מוצא פיו אוצרו:	3 [לה] עריך ערוכ[ם]
ואין מעצור לתשועתו:	4 ויעשי (?) [ר]צונו יצליח
ואין[ן] [ג] סתר מנגד עיניו	5 מעשה כל בשר נגדו
ש מספר לתשועתו	6 מעולם ועד עולם יביט
ואין נפלא וחזק ממנו:	7 אין קמיון ומעש עמו
כי הכל לצרכו . . .	8 אין ל . . . ה למה זה
כי הכל בעתו יגבר:	9 רוח (?) שמחה (?)
וכבדו תבל ריחותה:	10 ברכות כיאר הציפה
ויהפך למלח משקה	11 ועמו נויים יוריש
כן לזרים . . . לקללה (?)	12 ת תמים יישרו
כן לרעים מוב ולרעים[ם]	13 ב חלק מראש
ואש וברזל ומלח:	14 אדם מים
דם ענב יצהר ובגד	15 חלב ודבש
כן לרעים לרעה נחפזו	16 לתמים ייטיבו
לזרע . . . [הר]ים ייעתיק	17

לכל צורך ב'ספיקו

מסומה(?)

בשתו יגבר

לזרע

Verso.

גם אלה למשפט . . .	18	אש וברד רע ודבר	גם נבחרו
וחרב נקמות להחרים . . .	19	חית שן עקרב ופתן	
והמה באוצרו לעת יפקדו	20	כל אלה לצורכם נבראו	
ובחקם לא ימרו פיו;	21	בצותו אותם ישישו	
והתבוננתי ובכתב הנהיתי	22	על כן מראש הת[אמ]צתי	
לכל צורך בעתו יספוק;	23	מעשה אל כלם טובים	
כי הכל בעתו טוב	24	אל לאמר זה רע מה זה	אין מזה
וזמרו . . .	25	על . . . בכל לב הרנינו	ופה עליו
ועול כבד על ^(פ) בן ^(פ) אדם	26	עסק גדול חלק אל	
עד יום שובו אל אם כל חי;	27	מיום צאתו מרחם אמו	
עד לשוב עפר ואפר	28	מיושב בכסא לנבה	
ועד עושה שמלת . . .	29	מעומה צניף וציץ	
אימת מות תחר[ות] . . .	30	אך קנאה דאנה ופחד	
שינת לילה . . .	31	ועת נוחו על משכבו	
ומבין ב . . .	32	מעט לחיך כרנע ישקוט	רוח
כשדוד . . . רודף	33	מעט טעמחוזון נפשו	
מנוח . . .	34	עודך . . .	

ט ז
ז ט

TRANSLATION¹ OF

[Please note that these lines are

1. [. . . with song] and harp, and upon stringed instruments,
2. [The works of the] Lord are all good ;
3. [It is not for man to] estimate [their value] ;
4. [And to those who do His pleasure] He giveth prosperity,
5. The work of all flesh is before Him,
6. From everlasting to everlasting He beholdeth,
7. There is nothing small and light in His eyes ;
8. [None may say what is this], wherefore is that ;
9. [His word raiseth a wind of desolation] ;
10. *But also* hath overflowed the earth *with* blessings like a river,
11. [In] His wrath He driveth out the nations,
12. As [His ways] are plain to the perfect,
13. [The good to the good] He assigned from the beginning,
14. [The chief things] *for* man *are* water,
15. And [flour of wheat], milk and honey,
16. [All these things] are good [to the perfect] ;
17.
18. Fire and bad hail and pestilence ;
19. Beast of teeth, scorpion and viper,
20. All these were created for their use,
21. In His commanding them they rejoice,
22. Therefore from the beginning I stood fast,
23. The works of the Lord are all good,
24. None may say, This is bad ; what is it ?
25. Therefore with all the heart praise,
26. A great occupation the Lord assigned,
27. From the day he goeth out of the womb of his mother,
28. From him who sitteth on the throne on high,
29. From him who weareth mitre and diadem,
30. *Nought* but envy, trouble and anxiety,
31. And in the time of his resting upon his bed,
32. A little [folding of the hands], he is quiet for a moment,
33. There is little counsel [in the] vision of his soul,
34. [Whilst thou art]⁵

¹ The translation follows the emendations and supplements suggested in the notes to the Hebrew text. Passages and words included in square brackets are doubtful. Each line must be read, as in the Hebrew, with the corresponding line on the next page, which together form the verse.

THE FRAGMENT.

to be read across both pages.]

And thus thou shalt say in rejoicing,	1.
They shall suffice for every need in its season.	2.
[By the] <i>word</i> that proceedeth out of His mouth they were treasured up.	3.
And there is none that shall hinder His salvation.	4.
And there is nothing hid from before His eyes.	5.
[And who will] set limits to His ¹ [understanding].	6.
There is nothing ² strong and hard before Him.	7.
For all <i>things</i> were created [for their use].	8.
For everything shall prevail in its season.	9.
And ³ saturated the earth like a stream.	10.
And turneth into saltness the watered <i>lands</i> .	11.
So they are to the strangers [a curse].	12.
<i>So also</i> to the wicked [whether good or bad].	13.
And fire, and iron, and salt.	14.
And the blood of the grape, and oil, and clothing.	15.
So to the wicked they were turned into evil.	16.
. rooteth up mountains.	17.
Also these for the judgment [were created].	18.
And a sword of vengeance to destroy [the wicked].	19.
And they are in His treasure for the time <i>when</i> they are required. ⁴	20.
And in their law they rebel not <i>against the word</i> of His mouth.	21.
And I meditated, and left in writing :	22.
For every need in its season they shall suffice.	23.
For every <i>thing</i> is good in its season.	24.
And sing unto [His holy name].	25.
And a yoke [heavy for the son] of Adam,	26.
Until the day when he returneth to the mother of all living things ;	27.
To him who [sitteth] in dust and ashes ;	28.
To him who is covered with a cloth of [skin] ;	29.
Fear of death [strife and contention].	30.
The sleep of the night [departeth from his eyes].	31.
And from the midst of [terrors he awaketh].	32.
Like the spoiled one [he fleeth before] the pursuer.	33.
. rest.	34.

¹ Text, salvation.

² *Lit.* harder and stronger than He.

³ Or, intoxicated.

⁴ Or sought.

⁵ Or when he is soothed.

the rest of another **ב**, but the ink is so run together that it is fairly possible that there was once present the letter **ב**. The clause expresses the same idea as *v.* 20 below. (Cf. the Syriac, *v.* 39.) Note that neither illustration by waters (Greek, *v.* 17, suggested by **אוֹצְרוֹ**; cf. Ps. xxxii. 3?) nor that by the sun (Syriac, *v.* 21) is to be found in our text. The letters **עֵרִיךְ** are distinct, so that is no room for thinking of **יַעֲרִים עֲרִימָה**, or **יַעֲרִיב עֲרִיבִים**, which would account for the versions.

4. **וְעוֹשִׁי**. The word is very indistinct, and looks, at the first glance, like **תַּחֲשׁ**; but I am fairly certain of the reading given in the text. On the whole our text agrees more with the Greek (*v.* 18). The Syriac seems to give here *v.* 21 of our text, **וְאֵין מַעֲצוֹר**, etc. Cf. 1 Sam. xv. 6.

5. I am not certain that I read the marginal **מִסּוּמָה** correctly. Perhaps it is **מִנוּסָה**. It is an entirely different writing, and by a much later hand than the rest of the MS.

6. **מַעוֹלֵם יִיבִיט**. This verse is wanting in the Syriac, whilst the Greek (*v.* 20) has only the first clause. The second in the Greek corresponds with the second of the next verse in our text. **לְתַשׁוּעָתוֹ** gives no sense in this connexion. I suspect that it is a corruption from **לְתַבּוּנָתוֹ**. (Cf. Ps. cxlvii. 5, **לְתַבּוּנָתוֹ אֵין מַסְפֵּר**. Before **מַסְפֵּר** only the **שׁ** is legible. Perhaps we should supply **אֵין לְפָרֵשׁ**, or perhaps **וּמִי יֵשָׁא**. Cf. 1 Chron. xxvii. 23.

7. **וְאֵין**, etc. This verse corresponds with Syriac (*v.* 23), whilst the Greek has only retained the second clause (*v.* 20), **נִפְלֵא חֹזֶק**. This seems to be a favoured phrase with Sirach. See the quotation from Ecclus. in Genesis Rabbah, c. vii. Cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, iii. p. 690, No. 4, and notes to it, pp. 698 and 699.

8. Perhaps we should supply after *v.* 24 below **אֵין לְאִמֵּר מָה זֶה**. The word to be supplied in the second clause after **לְצַרְכּוֹ** is probably **נִבְרָא** (cf. below *v.* 20). Note the Syriac **מִתְנַבְּרִין**.

9. **רוּחַ שִׁמְחָה**. These words are doubtful, the letters being very faint. The second clause is legible enough, but the sense is obscure. From the context in *v.* 10 we must conclude that there was present here some noun in the feminine (say **אִמְרָתִי**), which in the one case brings destruction and ruin, and in the other bliss and prosperity.

10. **בְּרִכּוֹת**, etc. The subject is to be sought in the preceding verse (namely, **אִמְרָתִי**?). **הַצִּיּוֹ** in *hiphil* (cf. Deut. xi. 4). **רוּחַ** in *piel* has also the meaning saturating and *intoxicating* (see Hebrew Dictionaries).

11. **יִירִישׁ**. The now missing letter is probably **ב**. The word was misunderstood by the Greek and misread by the Syriac translator (reading **יִשְׁפּוֹט**). Cf. Dr. Edersheim to *v.* 23. **מִשְׁקָה**; cf. Gen. xiii. 10. **כֻּלָּה מִשְׁקָה**.

12. Probably we have to supply here **דְּרַבְּנֵי אֵת**, so that it would read. "*His (God's) ways are plain to the perfect.*" **כֵּן**, etc. Perhaps we

should supply בן ל' הַמֶּלֶךְ. In the word לְקַלֵּל only the letters לֵלֶה are certain. Cf. the Syriac, v. 31. By זֵרִים are meant the heathen.

13. Probably we must supply הַטּוֹב לַטּוֹב. The variant reading which is indicated by the ring-mark on וְלִרְעִים is faded. Perhaps it was וְרַע. Cf. the Syriac, v. 29, אֵן טַב וְאֵן בִּישׁ.

14. Perhaps we should supply רִאשִׁי צִרְכִּי (cf. Bensee C. xl. 16).

15. Supply סֵלַת הַטִּיִּם (Fritzsche to v. 27) or חֵלֶב הַטִּיִּם (Prof. Margoliouth, *EXPOSITOR*, 1890, I., p. 383). In these last two verses our text agrees more with the Greek.

16. Probably we have to supply כָּל אֱלֹה. For the marginal reading לִזְרָא cf. Num. xi. 20.

17. Of this whole verse only seven letters remain. To judge from these words, יַעֲתִיק הָרִים (cf. Job ix. 5), this verse must have agreed with the Syriac (see Commentaries to v. 28).

18. וּבִרְדֵּי רַע. The Greek reads רַעֲב (for רַע), whilst the Syriac (with which also the second clause agrees) paraphrases it with מוֹת. The last word probably reads נִכְרָאוּ.

19. הִיתָ שֵׁן. One would expect שֵׁן חִיָּה (cf. Deut. xxxii. 24), but both the Syriac and the Greek have the same order, which makes it probable that this was the order used by Sirach (cf. *Speaker* to v. 30). [לִהְיוֹרִים]. The space after this word may be filled with זֵרִים or אוֹבִיּוֹ.

20. כָּל אֱלֹה, etc. Of this verse only a part of the second clause is to be found in the Syriac (v. 39) in an entirely different connexion, whilst the Greek retained in the words *and they shall be ready*, etc., *when need is* (v. 31) a faint reminiscence of the first clause. See also above notes to v. 3.

21. בְּצִוּתוֹ, etc. Cf. Jewish Prayer-Book. יִשְׁתַּחֲוִי וְיִשְׁמְחִים לַעֲשׂוֹת רָצוֹן. חָק נָתַן וְלֹא יַעֲבֹר, [וּבַחֲקֵם קוֹנֵם]. Cf. Ps. cxlviii. 6.

22. עַל כֵּן, etc. This verse agrees with the Greek, the Syriac having misunderstood the whole passage (cf. the *Speaker*, v. 32). [הִנֵּחֲתִי], which confirms Fritzsche's suggestion; though in good Hebrew we would expect something like וּכְתַבְתִּי זֵאת זְכוֹרֹן בַּסֵּפֶר.

23. מַעֲשֵׂה אֱלֹהִים... יִסְפֹּק. The Greek (v. 33) seems to have read here יִסְפִּיק. See above note to v. 2.

24. אֵל לְאִמֶּר, etc. The Greek read with the margin in the first clause מִזֶּה, whilst in the Syriac, which read with the margin, in the second clause יִגְבֵּר (instead of טוֹב), whilst there is also some confusion with the second clause of v. 20, קָפִיסִין בְּאוֹצָרָא. See also Prov. xv. 23 and Eccles. iii. 11.

25. עַל, etc. Supply בֵּן. Of the second clause only three letters remain. The marginal note would suggest that we had in the text לִשְׁמוֹ הַגְּדוֹל, for which the margin read לִשְׁ הַקְּדוֹשׁ.

26. Note that there is no sign of a new chapter or section (פְּרָשָׁה) in the MS. [עֵבֶק]. This is a Neo-Hebrew word, but its use by Sirach

is also guaranteed from a quotation from Ecclus. in the B. Talmud, *Chagiga* J. 13a. (cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, as above note 7, end). The word signifies chiefly occupation or business. חָלָק seems to be a favoured expression with our author. Cf. above, v. 13. On the whole this verse agrees more with the Syriac than with the Greek.

27. מְיוֹם...שׁוּבוֹ, etc. This expression makes the reading ἐπιστροφῆς (see Fritzsche) very probable. Whether we have not to perceive in אֲרַעא דְּחַיָּא of the Syriac (xl. 1) some sort of euphemism for "grave-yard" (as with the Jews in the middle ages, who called it בֵּית הַחַיִּים, cf. Zunz, *Zur Literatur und Geschichte*, p. 442) is difficult to say.

28. מְיוֹשֵׁב, etc. Note that v. 2 (in Ch. xl.), *their imagination*, etc. (Greek), or *their glory*, etc. (Syriac), which hardly gives good sense in either version, is not to be found in our text. Perhaps the whole verse is only a double of v. 30 put in the wrong place, the Greek reading אֵת (for אֶךְ), and the Syriac רִגָּה (for קִנְאָה); though it is impossible to account satisfactorily for every word in it. בְּכַסָּא לְנִבְהָ. Cf. Prov. ix., כַּסָּא לְשׁוּבָא. מְרַמֵּי קֶרֶת. Perhaps we should read לְיוֹשֵׁב, though in this case we should expect עַל. Cf. Isaiah xlvii. 1; Jonah iii. 6; and Job ii. 8 (בתוך). The marginal reading לְיוֹשֵׁב may be explained by such parallels as Isaiah lxi. 3 and Esther iv. 1 offer.

29. מְעוּטָה, etc. For צִנִּיף וְצִיץ (mitre and diadem) see Dictionaries, but they never occur in connexion with עֲטָה. שְׂמֹלֶת. Perhaps we should supply שְׂעָר (cf. Zech. xiii. 5), which may also be taken for שְׂעָר (cf. 2 Kings vii. 10). The marginal reading עֶרֶךְ (שְׂמֹלֶת עֶרֶךְ) is very indistinct. It would be interesting to know the authority of the A.V. for the marg. read. "to the porter."

30. אֶךְ. This word was misread both by the Greek and Syriac versions (v. 3) for אֵת. תַּחְרוּת. This is certainly a Neo-Hebrew word (see Talmudical Dictionaries) occurring in connexion with שְׂנָאָה and קִנְאָה, meaning strife, quarrel, etc. There is still a space in the MS. for a short word, which might perhaps be supplied by וְרִיב. The margin had also וּמִדָּן.

31. וְעַתָּה לַיְלָה. Perhaps the words to be supplied at the end of the second clause are תִּדְרַם מְעִינִי (cf. Gen. xxxi. 40). This would account for the Syriac, whilst the Greek perhaps misread it for רַעֲיוֹנִי.

32. מַעֲטָה לְחֵיק, etc. This verse is missing in the Syriac. The word לְחֵיק gives no sense, unless it is a corruption of לְחַבֵּק (cf. Prov. xxvi. 33). The marginal reading רוּחַ is probably to be pointed רִנָּה, meaning to be comfortable, to feel refreshed (cf. Biblical and Talmudic Dictionaries, s.v. רוּחַ or רוּחָה). וּמִבֵּין ב'. Perhaps we should supply בְּלָחוּת לְאוֹר מְצַפָּה (which the Greek read מְצַפָּה. Cf. Fritzsche, xl. 6). We should then translate *from the midst of terrors* (supposed to surround him, see Job xviii. 11) *he is watching* (or hoping, cf. Job iii. 9) *for the light* (of the day).

33. מעט טעם. We expect, of course, a final Mim. The word טעם again runs together with the following חיון, which shows distinctly some carelessness here on the part of the copyist. Perhaps we had here 'ט' בחיון נפ', meaning, *there is little taste* (or counsel, or sense; see Dictionaries, *s.v.* טעם) *in the vision of his heart*. [כשרור. Supply ינום לפני. On the whole this verse agrees more with the Syriac.

34. [עורך. This word can also be read שרך. There is just space for one short word before the ו or י. Perhaps it was עת. שרך is only to be found in the Targumim and in the Talmud, and means to be quiet, to be soothed (see Dictionaries, *s.v.* שרך). Whether the Greek read this strange word ישע (cf. *Speaker's Commentary* to lx. 7) is difficult to say, as almost the rest of the whole line is now torn off. [מנוח. The letters are very indistinct. The marginal readings כי ער and כי אה belonged to v. 18, of which nothing remains in our Fragment.

I have confined myself in the foregoing notes to the most necessary explanations in our Fragment; not entering into the question of metre, nor enlarging upon the nature of the Neo-Hebrew words and non-classical constructions we have noticed, nor even examining sufficiently the relation of our text to the Greek and Syriac versions. Want of space compels me to postpone the discussion of these questions to a future occasion. I am also sorely pressed for time, since many scholars both here and on the continent have expressed the wish to see the Fragment published without any delay; and I am, on my part, not less anxious to hear as soon as possible the opinions of those who have made Sirach the special subject of their studies.

But even these meagre notes will suffice to show that our text is not a translation. It will be easily gathered from them that its correspondence with the versions changes almost in every line, agreeing in some places with the Greek, in others with the Syriac. In other places, again, it agrees with *neither* of these versions, omitting whole clauses which are to be found both in the Greek and in the Syriac, or offering new readings which have been either misunderstood or misread by the translators. Cer-

tain clauses, again, are to be found in our MS. which are wanting in *both* versions, or are only reproduced by a very short paraphrase. There cannot, therefore, be even the shadow of a doubt that our text represents nothing else but the original. Even the marginal glosses testify to this fact. Such differences of *plena* and *defecta* as צורך and צרך, or such fine variants as פיו and פיהו, cannot possibly have been suggested by any translation, and could only have been made from some other copy of the original.

As to the date when the MS. was written, I have already remarked in the introduction that the writing points to an early period, not later than the eleventh century. I should like to add that the fact that the MS. is only paper (not parchment) is in no way unfavourable to such a comparatively early date. Among the fragments acquired by the University Library of Cambridge, from the same part of the world which Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson have traversed on their recent travels, we have no less than eight documents written on the same kind of paper as our Fragment, and *dated* from the eleventh century. But for the fact that a lapse of two or three generations is necessary to account for the disappearance of the vowels and accents which were still used in the copies of Sirach from which Saadya quotes, there would not be the least objection to placing the date of our MS. in the tenth century, the age of this Gaon. It may indeed be suggested that the protest of the Caraites against the imitation of the Bible, even in its external form, had something to do with the gradual disappearance of these signs, which become rarer with every age in books not forming a part of the Scriptures.

Nor must we think that our Fragment represents only a quotation from Sirach in some Rabbinical book now lost to us. Not only are its contents too long for a mere quotation, but the way in which our Fragment is written makes such a suggestion quite inadmissible. Passages

quoted from the Bible are never divided into verses or arranged in columns even when the citations come from the poetical books. They are simply reproduced as prose, one line following the other, without the least sign to distinguish it from the rest of the page. Our Fragment, therefore, comes directly from a MS. containing the whole of Ecclesiasticus in the language in which Sirach wrote it, subject, of course, to changes, corruptions and mutilations owing to the carelessness of copyists and other mishaps which every work must experience during a period of nearly thirteen centuries.

The significance of the Fragment consists thus not only in what it offers, but also in the hope it holds out to us of fresh finds. If I may add a wish to this hope, it is, that it may be again Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, to whose zeal for everything relating to the Scriptures Semitic scholarship is already under such great obligations, whose further finds will prove the means of restoring to us the whole of Ecclesiasticus.

S. SCHECHTER.

THE SACRIFICE OF ISAAC.

“And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham: and he said, Here am I.”—GENESIS xxii. 1.

I PROPOSE to discuss in this paper what is commonly called the sacrifice of Isaac; but, as a matter of fact, there was no sacrifice of Isaac: the sacrifice was forbidden by God, peremptorily forbidden, at the very moment when it was about to be made.

Imagine the horror that we should have felt if at the beginning of Jewish history the father of the faithful had actually offered a human sacrifice to God, that sacrifice being his son; and had offered him by the Divine command. But no such dreadful tragedy ever occurred. That awful stain of blood does not appear on the pages of the Hebrew Scriptures. To some of us, perhaps, the moral difficulties of the story as it stands are sufficiently grave; but if Isaac had been actually put to death by his father and offered to God as a sacrifice, and if we had been told that this was done in obedience to a Divine command, I suppose that we should all have felt that the story was incredible.

In intention, however, Abraham did really offer this sacrifice; and though he was prevented by the interference of God from actually offering it, the story declares that what he meant to do was imposed upon him by the authority of God.

And so, to put the objection roughly, Abraham, in obedience to the will of God, is represented as intending to commit a horrible crime. No doubt he was prevented by God Himself from committing it; but he was in the very act of committing it; he had stretched forth his hand and had taken the knife, as the picturesque narrative tells us, when the angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven and arrested him.

This, I say, is the difficulty. Abraham, in obedience to the will of God, is represented as intending to commit a horrible crime.

The common answer—and it is good as far as it goes, only it does not go far enough—is very simple. We are reminded that although *we* have no right to determine how long another man shall live, and when he shall die, God has. He may permit one man to live for eighty or a hundred years, though he has been guilty of great crimes: He may cut off a saint in the morning of his days. God's authority over us is supreme. Had he taken the life of Isaac by lightning, or earthquake, or fever, His righteousness could not have been impeached. He is God, and to God belongs the absolute authority to determine the measure of our years. We may be sure that He does not exercise His authority arbitrarily and without great reason; but His authority is final, and it is above our criticism. And if instead of taking the life of Isaac by lightning, or earthquake, or fever, He had determined to take it by the hand of Abraham, how could we charge either God or Abraham with a crime?

This reply satisfied Bishop Butler. In the third chapter of the second part of his *Analogy* he says: "Men have no right to either life or property, but what arises solely from the grant of God: when this grant is revoked, they cease to have any right at all in either: and when this revocation is made known, as surely it is possible it may be, it must cease to be unjust to deprive them of either."¹ . . . That is, some acts which would be criminal apart from God's command cease to be criminal when He commands them. To use a familiar example: if without any authority a servant of mine opens my purse and takes out a five-pound note and uses it for himself, that is a crime; but if I tell him to do it, then, though he does precisely the same

¹ Butler: *Analogy*, Book ii. c. 3, § 27, p. 239, Clarendon Press Edition.

outward acts,—looks for the purse, finds it, opens it, takes the note, spends it for himself,—he commits no wrong. God had authority over Isaac's life: had Abraham resolved to take it without God's authority, he would have intended to commit a crime; there was no crime when God told him to take it.

Butler admits that if God were to command a succession of acts which without His command would be immoral, they might gradually lead to the formation of an immoral habit; but he contends that a few detached commands would have no such tendency. This means—to go back to my illustration—that if I told my servant once or twice to use the contents of my purse, or part of them, for himself, it would do him no harm; but that if I told him to do it day after day for a month or six weeks, he might form the habit of appropriating my money to his own use, and might continue to do it even when I gave him no authority, and so would become a thief.

But there is one phrase in the passage which I quoted from Butler that occasions a difficulty. He says that *when God revokes His grant of property or life to any man, it must be possible to make the revocation known*. The late Professor Mozley, of Oxford, has made some very striking observations on that part of Butler's reply. I shall have occasion this morning to quote Professor Mozley's words rather frequently, but it would be difficult for me to say how much I owe to his keen and profound discussion of this story. I cannot, I think, appeal to his authority to support all that I have to say about it, but perhaps most of the principal things I have to say were either said or suggested by him. He was one of the most robust thinkers that we have had in England during this century.

Butler takes for granted that there could be no difficulty in making it clear to Abraham that it was God's will that he was to sacrifice Isaac. But Professor Mozley says, and

says justly, that nothing could prove to you or me that it was the will of God that we should sacrifice a child of our own.

No miracle could prove it. We have been taught both by the Old Testament and the New to test the miracle by the precept or the doctrine it is intended to support: if the precept shocks our conscience, if the doctrine contradicts what we already know to be the truth, we are to stand by conscience and truth and to reject the miracle. Professor Mozley says, in substance, that the rights of human life are now so strongly felt, they are so intimate a part of the moral progress of the race, that no miracle could practically act as sufficient evidence to warrant the infraction of them.¹

But it was not so in Abraham's time. There is nothing in the story to suggest that he was at all uncertain as to whether the command came from God, or that his uncertainty had been overcome by any stupendous miracle.

The explanation lies in one immense difference between ancient and modern times, and this difference reaches the very heart of the difficulty which the story creates. A great movement in the moral and religious life of the world has issued in investing the individual man with inalienable rights. That movement has derived its chief inspiration and strength from the revelation of God in Christ, but has been powerfully aided by other forces of a less noble kind. At last, indeed, and in our own days, there have come signs of reaction against it. We have discovered that the doctrine of individualism may be carried too far, and the claims of society, as contrasted with the claims of the individual man—what we call Socialism as contrasted with individualism—are now clamorous for recognition.

In Abraham's time, and in the early history of all nations, individualism was unknown, and a form of Socialism pre-

¹ J. B. Mozley: *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, pp. 33, fol.

veiled. "Primitive Society," as Sir Henry Maine has said, "has for its units not individuals, but groups of men united by the reality or the fiction of blood relationship."¹ "Ancient law," he says again, "knows next to nothing of individuals. It is concerned not with individuals, but with families, not with single human beings, but groups."² Again, and largely as the result of this, in those early days, "the eldest male parent—the eldest ascendant—is absolutely supreme in his household. His dominion extends to life and death, and is as unqualified over his children and their houses as over his slaves; indeed"—according to Sir Henry Maine—"the relations of sonship and serfdom appear to differ in little beyond the higher capacity which the child in blood possesses of becoming one day the head of a family himself. The flocks and herds of the children are the flocks and herds of the parent"; and further, the parent held all this property not as we hold it, as a matter of personal right, but "in a representative rather than in a proprietary character."³ It was what might be called *tribal* Socialism. It not only denied the right to private ownership in land and other material wealth, but private ownership of a man's own limbs and life. Our modern idea of a man as having a separate right to his own property and to his own life did not exist. As an act of justice in those days, a man's whole family was sometimes put to death with him as the punishment of his crime. A man's children were a man's property—not less dear for that; but the relationship was something so different from the relationship that exists among us that we can hardly understand it.

In modern times, as Prof. Mozley puts it, a man's life belongs to himself; to put him to death as a sacrifice is to give up that which is not ours to give. It was not so in primitive society; a man's life belonged to his tribe, and could be disposed of by the head of his tribe. To Abraham

¹ *Ancient Law*, p. 183.

² *Ib.*, p. 258.

³ *Ib.*, pp. 123, 124.

Isaac is "a treasure of his own which he has to give up, a treasure which is dearer to him than any other earthly thing, and which it is the greatest trial of his life to part with, but which is still his own, *belonging* to him, and appropriate to him to surrender." ¹

To Abraham therefore the command to sacrifice his son would have a moral character altogether different from that which a similar command would have to us. This has to be remembered throughout the story.

Secondly, we can imagine that as Abraham passed from one end of the promised land to another he would sometimes actually witness the human sacrifices which the heathen people who then held the country offered occasionally to their gods, and he might still more frequently hear of them. The question would occur to him whether *he* was capable of a similar devotion to the Eternal. Was *his* reverence for the supreme God as deep—would it prove, in time of trial, as effective as their reverence for their inferior divinities? He broods over the question. Isaac is dearer to him than all the world besides. And further, it is through Isaac that all his visions of future greatness and glory for his descendants were to be fulfilled. Nor was this all: through Isaac he and his descendants were to be channels of Divine blessing to all nations. Could he sacrifice Isaac, at the command of the Eternal, as the heathen were sacrificing their own sons? Perhaps he doubts. How could he sacrifice the son that he loves with so immense a love? How could he destroy, with his own hands, his great hope, the hope of the human race, the hope which had come to him through the wonderful goodness of God? Everything else that he had he would sacrifice at the command of God;—but this! was it not too much? It would be, no doubt, the final, the supreme proof of his faith in God and his obedience to Him; but was it possible?

¹ J. B. Mozley: *Ruling Ideas*, p. 49.

Then came the Divine voice. If to sacrifice Isaac seemed to Abraham the final, the supreme proof of his fidelity to God, he must do it. Abraham's own conscience declared that this would be the highest proof of his faith and obedience. It may be—it was, in this instance—an unenlightened conscience. But what he feels would be the highest proof of his faithfulness to God, this the voice of God requires from him. Abraham obeys: but at the moment that he is about to put Isaac to death, God interferes: it is not by the shedding of human blood on the altar that God can be honoured. Abraham has shown that he does not shrink from even the extreme test of his faith in God; whatever God asks for he will surrender—his own son, and all the infinite hopes that were to be fulfilled through him. There lies the glory of the deed. Let me put it briefly: there are two elements in Abraham's act; first, he himself believed that to sacrifice Isaac would be the most decisive proof of his devotion to God; and then the voice of God required him to give this proof.

A great act like this, to quote Prof. Mozley again, is dramatic, while character is only didactic. A great act is like "a great poem, a great law, a great battle, any great event; it is a movement, it is a type which fructifies and reproduces itself."¹ "Do you say," he continues, "that such an act could not be done now? That is all the more reason why it should have been done; why it should have been done when it could be done. . . . It seems to belong suitably to the Divine Governor of the world to extract out of every state of mankind the highest and most noble acts to which the special conceptions of the age can give rise, and direct those earlier ideas and modes of thinking toward such great moral achievements as are able to be founded upon them."

¹ Mozley: *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, pp. 59, 60, 61, and 55.

That last sentence of Prof. Mozley's is the clear statement of a principle which has to be remembered in all our moral judgments of the past. To us, for example, the monastic conception of the perfect life seems inadequate and false; but, given that conception, we can see what nobleness, what zeal, what sanctity are illustrated in the lives of many of the ancient monks. The vehicle through which they expressed the innermost life was miserably imperfect; but beneath and within the imperfection of the expression we can see how beautiful and divine the life was. To us the crusades appear to have had their origin in superstition. The Christian men of crusading times were eager to rescue the Sepulchre of our Lord from the hands of the infidel. For this nobles sold their estates, and kings spent the wealth of their kingdoms; for this they left for years their homes and wives and children, and died by thousands and tens of thousands—died in prison, died of famine, died of disease, died on the battle-field. If instead of endeavouring to rescue from the infidel the Sepulchre where the body of Christ had rested, they had endeavoured with the same passion, the same heroism, and with the same reckless devotion of life and treasure, to make known to the infidels the grace and glory of the Christ who had died and risen again and was now the Lord and Saviour of men, how much nobler would have been the results! But we have never yet shown the same earnestness and enthusiasm in trying to rescue men from sin that they may become living temples of the Living Christ, that the crusaders showed in trying to rescue the rocky tomb where the dead Christ was buried. Their ideas of how Christ was to be honoured were, as we think, grossly superstitious. Yes, but how intense, how pathetic was the passion of many of them for honouring Him! We can but do what seems to us our best and highest for

God. Abraham meant to do it, and this has given him enduring glory.

God "*proved*" Abraham—tested his faith. It was to test whether Abraham really held fast the conviction which broke out in his intercessions for Sodom and Gomorrah,—“Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” Was Abraham really sure that God was Supreme, and that the highest duty and blessedness of man lay in obeying Him? Was Abraham certain—absolutely certain—that God would be true to His promise that by Abraham’s descendants through Isaac all nations would be blessed? Was he certain that God would be true to it, even though Isaac was offered as a sacrifice on the altar? Abraham came out of the testing process gloriously.

And God "*proves*" us. His first great proof of us is in a manner the precise opposite of that to which He subjected Abraham. God proved Abraham by testing whether he had sufficient faith in God to sacrifice his son at God’s command. God proves us by testing whether we have sufficient faith in God to believe that He loves us well enough to sacrifice His Son for us. How many of us admire—really admire—the beauty and grace of our Lord’s character and the depth of His teaching. Ah! but admiration is neither the first feeling nor the last that we ought to feel for Christ. It is too cold, too remote. The spectators on the shore who see a fisherman leap into a rough sea to save a drowning man, imperilling his own life to rescue the life of another—they may admire; but the drowning man himself who is saved feels something different from admiration, and far deeper: he owes his life to the man who has rescued him. And we, when once we see that the Eternal Son of God has died for us, feel something far deeper than admiration: we see how awful must have been our peril, and we confess that we owe our eternal life to Him. The Gospel of Christ proves us, tests

our belief in the love of God. The Gospel of Christ proves us ; it proves whether we believe that our sin is so awful a thing that even the infinite mercy of God may not be able to forgive it without sacrifice ; and it proves whether we believe that, notwithstanding our sin, the mercy of God is so great that the sacrifice has been offered.

But the ways in which God tests whether we really acknowledge Him as Supreme are many and varied. The great tests, no doubt, come seldom. They are the memorable moments of life, the turning points, the crises, in which we are judged—judged not finally, but with a judgment that often extends over many years, and has a large effect for good or evil on our whole subsequent history. The test is sometimes in secret, and how we have borne it is known only to God and ourselves ; we have stood it, and are greatly the stronger for it, but we win no human honour ; we have horribly failed, and shall suffer for it for years, but we incur no open disgrace. Sometimes the test is imposed in a form that reveals us to others as well as to ourselves—ruins us or makes us.

But these great crises, I repeat, come rarely : the way in which we meet them is largely determined by the way in which we stand tests of a more ordinary kind ; and these are constantly recurring. For us is God supreme ? The test has been imposed on us to-day. It will be imposed to-morrow, and every day in the week, and when you lie awake at night. It will be imposed in your business. God will be proving you from hour to hour to test whether your chief desire is to please Him. When men say and do things that would naturally provoke you to harsh and bitter words, He will be testing you. When you have the chance of getting undue advantage for yourself out of another man's ignorance, helplessness, poverty, He will be testing you. When impure thoughts are suggested to you by something that you see or hear in the

street or read in a book, He will be testing you. When you have done wrong, or made a mistake, and can easily hide it by a lie, He will be testing you. When you have the chance of being idle, without any one knowing it in the house where you are hired for working, He will be testing you. Always, everywhere, though at some times and in some places more than others, God is proving us—is testing whether He is really our God. And if we find that He is not,—that we are continually thinking thoughts, saying words, doing deeds that would be checked and prevented if He were really our God, it is clear that we have reason to be troubled, not merely by the particular offences which may show it—*they* may seem to be very trifling matters, things to be passed over by the Eternal and forgotten, but we have reason to be troubled by what they show; and if they show that God is not really God to us, this is fatal. Everything is wrong—wrong now; and if not remedied before it be too late, everything will be wrong for ever.

The analyst has a quart of water taken from the water-supply of a great city; he tests it, discovers clear indications of sewage poison. How minute is the quantity of poison in that quart of water! Surely no one need be alarmed about it. Not alarmed? It may mean death to thousands of men and women. As soon as it is discovered the city should be ready to spend hundreds of thousands—millions if necessary—to avert the danger.

And these *tests* of whether God is really our God, may seem equally insignificant. The thoughts, the feelings, the words, the actions, the habits, are in themselves, as we think, wholly unimportant. Yes, in *themselves* perhaps: but they show the quality of our life; the poison is there: and it is only as the very springs of life are purified that we can be saved from eternal death.

R. W. DALE.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

VII. THE ESCAPES OF JESUS.

OUR main source of information for what I venture to call "the Escapes of Jesus," is Mark's Gospel. The narrative of the second Evangelist contains sundry intimations of the desire of our Lord to get away from crowds into retreats where quiet intercourse with His disciples was possible. For hints are not wanting that this was the leading aim of these acts of retirement. As a sample may be cited these words: "They departed thence, and passed through Galilee, and He would not that any man should know it, for He was teaching His disciples."¹ Of the instruction communicated to the Twelve Mark has preserved comparatively little, but he more than any other of the Evangelists has made apparent how much they needed it. One of his realistic touches is a question he represents the Master as addressing to His disciples: How do ye not understand?² The disappointment bordering on impatience to which that question gave occasional expression was, it is to be feared, a chronic feeling in Christ's mind in reference to the men whom He had chosen. They were far enough from being ideal scholars, and Mark, of all the Evangelists, takes least pains to hide the fact. That they did not understand is patent in his pages, and that their Master sought opportunities for dispelling their ignorance is equally so. Thus witness is indirectly borne in this Gospel to extensive instruction, unreported in its pages, which we are prepared to find in fuller reports of our Lord's ministry. It is noticeable that Mark, as if conscious of the defect of his Gospel on the didactic side, tries to compensate for the lack of detail by general statements

¹ *Mark ix. 30, 31.*

² *Mark viii. 21.*

as to activity in teaching where Matthew, *e.g.*, strong in the didactic element, represents our Lord as occupied in a healing ministry. Instances may be found in Mark x. 1, xi. 18, compared with Matthew xix. 2, xxi. 14.

The escapes of Jesus took place in all directions possible for one whose work had for its geographical area the western margin of the sea of Galilee. He might retreat to the hill country behind, or to the eastern shore of the lake, or to the northern borderland. He made His escape successively in each of these directions; first once to the hill, then twice to the eastern shore, then twice (apparently) northwards, making five attempts in all to withdraw into congenial solitude. The first three were escapes from the people gathered in immense crowds, the last two were escapes not entirely from the people, but also from their religious leaders.

1. *The escape to the hill.* "He goeth up into the mountain."¹ That this movement was of the nature of an escape becomes clear when we attentively consider all the circumstances. Very significant in the first place is the fact stated just before, that Jesus instructed His disciples to have a boat waiting "because of the crowd, lest they should throng Him."² A boat, of course, could be of no use for an ascent to the hill-tops, but the point to be noted is the desire and intention to escape somehow, and in some direction, when the crowd became inconveniently large and eager. Such a crowd, it is next to be observed, had gathered around Jesus at the time when He made the ascent, a motley company of diseased persons, elbowing their way towards Him, and pressing in upon Him from every side, that they might touch His body and so get rid, as they hoped, of their ailments, while demoniacs on their knees screamed in hideous chorus: "Thou art the Son of God." It was a disorderly scramble for a cure threatening

¹ Mark iii. 13.

² Mark iii. 9.

danger to the person of the Healer, and distasteful to His spirit through the superstition it revealed; and it is no wonder that with all His "enthusiasm of humanity" He wished Himself well out of it. The ascent of the mountain was the expedient He adopted for self-extrication. And the next significant circumstance to be noted is that He goes not alone but accompanied by a band of men whom, in a manner not indicated, He picks out of the crowd to serve as a kind of bodyguard. They are doubtless chosen with an eye not merely to this immediate service of protection, but to prospective discipleship, a first selection out of which, after due acquaintance in the hill retreat, a second will be made sufficient with those previously called to make up the inner circle of the Twelve. But a defence against the mob they are meant in the first place to be, so implying a resolute purpose to secure for a season relief from an overwhelming embarrassing popularity. That the device succeeded appears from the fact that the multitude is represented as reassembling on learning that Jesus had descended from the mountain. They had not followed, they had dispersed to their homes, but on the report spreading, "He is back again," the scarcely lulled enthusiasm easily revived.

How was Jesus occupied on the hill-top? Mark is silent on the point, but one cannot hesitate as to the answer. What could He be doing but teaching His disciples, considering their need of instruction, the extreme difficulty of finding leisure for this important work, and the welcome recreation that would come from so congenial a change of occupation? And seeing that the ascent of the mountain was of the nature of an escape from a too importunate crowd, the probability is that the sojourn up there was prolonged so as to give time for the vast gathering to disperse, and lasted for at least some days, during which a considerable body of instruction could be given in separate

lessons, each day having its own theme. In short, all points to this as the occasion on which the so-called *Sermon on the Mount* was delivered. That sermon, as reported in Matthew, is probably the summary of a week's instruction in a summer school at which the recently selected body of disciples, including the Twelve, were the audience. Instead of the "Sermon on the Mount" it might, as suggested in my first paper, be more appropriately called the *Teaching on the Hill*. For it is teaching, not preaching, and the persons addressed are not a large miscellaneous crowd, but a select band of men with some aptitude for disciple-lore. This distinction between sermon and teaching, people and disciples, while not without justification in Matthew's narrative, is by no means firmly adhered to there, and all traces of it have disappeared in Luke's version, where the famous discourse of our Lord assumes the character of an address to a large assembly such as that from which in Mark's narrative He is represented as making His escape. Yet the circumstances as described in the second Gospel, the probability that the ascent there mentioned was the occasion on which the discourse was delivered, and last, but not least, the nature of its contents compel the conclusion that a limited body of disciples, not a miscellaneous assembly, constituted the audience.

Why has Mark not reported any of that memorable teaching? Possibly because he was not able. Such a body of deep thought could not be treasured up for long years in the memory of any disciple, however attentive or intelligent; therefore Peter, Mark's apostolic source, could not repeat it from memory in his preaching. In all probability it would have been lost to the world, unless some disciple, Matthew, *e.g.*, had made written memoranda at the time. These memoranda, we must suppose, formed a place in the *Oracles of the Lord*, which, according to

Papias, that disciple compiled; and thence passed, in diverse versions, to the pages of our first and third Gospels. But why could not Mark also have got them from the same source? Probably for the simple reason that he did not know it. The contrary view indeed has been very confidently maintained by some scholars, very specially by Dr. Bernhard Weiss. While acknowledging the ingenuity of that able theologian's reasoning, I think the point very doubtful, and one of my reasons for doing so is just this, that Mark is so entirely silent about the teaching on the hill.

2. *The first escape over the lake to the eastern shore.* This took place, according to Mark, on the day of the Parabolic Discourse, and that it was indeed of the nature of an escape is very clear from his narrative. On the same day at eventide, when He had ended his address from the boat to the vast multitude on the shore, Jesus abruptly says to His disciples, "Let us cross over to the other side."¹ Whereupon leaving the multitude where they were (not sending them away, as the Authorised Version has it), the disciples take Him *as He was*, i.e., without delay, and without any preparations for a journey, along with them in the boat eastward as directed.² It was an escape along the only possible line of retreat, landing on the western shore being impossible owing to the vastness of the crowd. To get away even seaward was not easy, other boats having gathered around that in which Jesus was, full of people eager to get near the Speaker that they might hear Him distinctly.³ These apparently trivial particulars, as given in the Second Gospel, are obviously realistic reminiscences of an eyewitness, and when duly considered call up a vivid picture of the situation. Jesus, weary with talking, and with the excitement of a great assembly (so weary that He falls asleep as soon as the boat begins to

¹ Mark iv. 35.² Mark iv. 36.³ Mark iv. 36.

move), desires quiet and rest, and at a glance perceives that there is only one way of obtaining them, and gives orders accordingly. His disciples, gathering His wish from word, tone, and gesture, with the promptitude of experts move off at once, without a thought of where precisely they are going, or what is to be done in the matter of food and lodgings. Possibly their impression is that the voyage eastwards is simply a roundabout way of getting to the western shore, and so home, after the people have dispersed in the evening twilight. In that case the movement would have been simply an escape without an ulterior object. But it is probable that Jesus had more in view—the obtaining of a time of leisure in a region where He was unknown, during which He might discuss with the disciples the incidents of the day, and the lessons to be gathered from them. For the parabolic discourse, and especially the utterance of the Parable of the Sower, was an important event, which meant much for the people, for Jesus, and for the Twelve.

From all the synoptical accounts it is clear that the parabolic discourse, and especially the main parable, formed the subject of conversation between Jesus and His disciples. Over the time, the place, and the precise details of the conversation, a certain amount of obscurity hangs, but some points are clear: that the disciples desired to know why their Master had spoken to the people so, that He gave them explanations on that point, and that He further took pains to impress on them their responsibilities as disciples.¹

As to the first, what the Twelve desired to know was probably, not why their Master spoke to the people in parables, but why He spoke to them in *such* parables? That He spoke to them in parables could be no surprise, for He had been doing that all along, in every synagogue and wayside discourse. But in parables like the Sower

¹ Vide Mark iv. 10-25.

there was, the disciples felt, a new element—a tone of disappointment audible, a spirit of criticism unmistakable. They perceived, of course, that these critical parables grew out of the Master's preaching experience; and at bottom what they wanted to know was, why He was dissatisfied? And His reply, in substance, was that for various reasons hinted at in the Sower, and further explained afterwards, in very many cases His efforts had been vain. The word had not fructified, the hearer had not heard to profit.

From reflections on this depressing topic the transition would be easy to the subject of disciple-responsibility. The moral of the parable discourse, so far as the Twelve were concerned, was: if the word fail of effect in so many instances, see that there be no failure in your case. The Master was saying to them indirectly: You are my hope, you, specially if not exclusively, are my good soil—soft, deep, and clean; see that ye bring forth fruit abundant and mature. This He said to them directly afterwards in private intercourse, when He exhorted them to take heed how they heard, so that they might understand, indicated that intelligence would be in proportion to attention, and imposed on them the duty of communicating knowledge thus attained; in parabolic language the duty of placing the lamp on the stand.¹ By the choice parable of the Blade, the Ear, and the Ripe Corn² He gave them to understand that He did not expect them to realize His ideal in a day. He would give them time, and be content if they brought forth the ripe fruit of their schooling eventually, as the result of a law of gradual growth.

3. The next escape also took the shape of a voyage across the lake, this time in a north-easterly direction. It occurred shortly after the return of the Twelve from their house-mission in Galilee.³ Its character as an escape is

¹ Mark iv. 21-25.

² Mark iv. 26-29.

³ Mark vi. 30, 31.

distinctly revealed in the terms in which the proposal was introduced by Jesus. Its ostensible aim, as therein represented, was to secure an interval of rest for the disciples, not, as one might naturally imagine, from the fatigues of the mission, but from the incessant demands created by a constant stream of people coming and going, not leaving even so much leisure as was needful for taking food.¹ The attempt to get away from the excited crowd in this case, as in the former, proved a failure, though not for the same reason. In the former instance the plan was frustrated through an unexpected encounter with a madman, this time defeat was due to the enthusiasm of a multitude determined not to be baulked, who, observing that the Master and His disciples were making for the head of the lake, started off at a run, and made such speed as to be on the ground before them.² In both cases Jesus had to do what He had not intended—perform a wonderful work; on the earlier occasion curing a demoniac, who imagined himself possessed by a legion of devils; on the latter feeding thousands of hungry people in a desert.

There is a mystery about this third flight from the people. One cannot but suspect that more than mere physical rest was aimed at. What was the meaning of sending the Twelve away *alone*, after the feeding, back to the western shore?³ It looks as if there was something going on which made their absence desirable. And what did that coming and going of the people on the other side, before the eastward voyage, signify? No mention is made of sick being brought to be healed. Something else seems to be in the people's minds for the moment. What can it be? The fourth Gospel here gives us a clue in the remarkable statement that the people whom Jesus fed in the desert desired perforce to make Him a king.⁴ If that was really the fact,

¹ Mark vi. 31.

² Mark vi. 33.

³ Mark vi. 45.

⁴ John vi. 15.

the idea did not come into their heads then for the first time. The project then only reached its crisis. That was what the coming and going had been about, and it was to the *disciples* rather than to the Master that the stream of visitors came, finding them not unsympathetic. The movement, congenial to the spirit of Galileans, and too easily put into their minds, may have sprung out of the house-mission. The Twelve had been only too successful. They had talked about the Kingdom, and this was what came of it—a political scheme. Wild as it may seem to us, it would appear perfectly natural to them. What was to be the issue of that immense enthusiasm? Was it to end in smoke? Was not the inevitable consummation to make the marvellous Teacher and Healer the actual head of a reformed state?

No better explanation can be given of Christ's manifest desire to separate His disciples from the people than the supposition that the Galileans entertained such a project, and that the Twelve more or less sympathized with it at the time of their return from their mission. Assuming this to be the fact, we understand what kind of "rest" was aimed at. It was, above all, rest from *illusions*, from the fever of false, foolish enthusiasms, from mental excitement over a fond scheme which, if not resolutely opposed, would end in disaster. Such rest Jesus must at all hazards secure for His disciples, if they are to be of any use to Him, to help and not frustrate His plans. The time has come when the question, Whither? must be dealt with. The Master knows the true answer to the question, but the disciples do not. A false issue is in their view. The first thing to be done, therefore, is peremptorily to negate the issue they contemplate. To accomplish this was the real motive of the voyage towards the north-eastern shore. The next task will be to make known the true issue. To secure leisure for explanations on this momentous topic was a

leading motive for the two flights remaining to be mentioned.

4. *The escape in the direction of Tyre and Sidon.*¹ Some Biblical scholars are of opinion that there was only one excursion to the northern confines of Palestine, which in the Gospel narratives has, through some confusion in the tradition, got broken up into two, a longer one into the territories of Tyre and Sidon, and a later, shorter one to the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi. This question may be left on one side all the more that, even if there were, as I believe, two distinct journeys, they were one in general aim. The common purpose of both was to get away for a season, completely and securely, at once from enthusiastic but foolish crowds, from well-meant but futile political plots, and from the ill-will of religious leaders more to be feared than anything, that in solitude and silence Jesus might brace His own spirit for the fatal crisis which from concurrent signs He knew to be approaching, and at the same time prepare His disciples for an issue of which they little dreamt. That He went so far away this time needs no explanation. The reason simply was that not otherwise could He attain His end. The previous attempt to escape had failed because the place of retreat was too near the scenes of labour. The new movement of retirement, therefore, must be towards regions so remote that pursuit was not to be apprehended. And it must be northwards, not southwards, for geographical and for moral reasons. The northern boundary lay nearest Galilee, and the time has not come for the southern journey. Jesus will go to Jerusalem to *die*; He must go to the north to *prepare* to die.

The first of the two northerly excursions seems to have been of considerable extent. Mark names in connection with it Tyre, Sidon, *Decapolis*, and the Sea of Galilee.

¹ *Mark* vii. 24.

Connecting these points, we get a journey first northwards to and through the above-named maritime countries, then eastwards over the Lebanon range to the neighbourhood of Damascus;¹ then southwards and westwards through the region of the ten cities, and finally over the Jordan and back through Galilee to the original point of departure. If this was the route, it would occupy a considerable time. How were the days of that eventful pilgrimage filled up? The Gospel records here are very meagre. Mark tells us most, but even he reports only a couple of incidents, the encounter with the woman of Canaan, and the cure of a deaf-mute apparently at some point on the route through Decapolis. In both cases he takes pains to show how much Jesus desired privacy. In connection with the earlier incident he remarks that Jesus "would have no man know" where He was,² and in connection with the latter he carefully notes that Jesus took the deaf-mute "aside from the multitude privately," and after the cure charged all who witnessed it to "tell no man."³ The second Evangelist stands alone in the emphasis with which he brings out this fact in reference to the later period of our Lord's life, though even he fails to explain fully its rationale. That, happily, with due reflection on the data supplied, we are able to do for ourselves.

Both the incidents reported by Mark possess their own distinctive points of interest. The prominent feature in the earlier occurrence is the seeming reluctance of Jesus to grant the succour craved by a distressed mother for her suffering daughter. In the latter, while still bent on privacy, He made no objection to working the cure asked, though in this case also the sufferer was not improbably a Gentile. What did that reluctance mean? In Matthew's narrative Jesus is reported to have pled as an excuse for it

¹ Pliny includes Damascus in Decapolis (*H.N.V.*, 16).

² *Mark* vii. 24.

³ *Mark* vii. 33, 36.

that His mission was to the lost sheep of Israel. The plea might have provoked the rejoinder, Why then are you here? Israel's Saviour a fugitive from Israel's land! Perhaps that was just what Jesus Himself was thinking of at the moment, and also what He wished His disciples to reflect on. His position as a fugitive was fitted of itself to raise in His mind the question as to the ultimate destination of His Gospel. In the circumstances the coincidence of the Syrophenician woman's request, in spite of His desire to remain unknown, would readily assume the significance of an *omen*. An isolated case might thus be transformed into a representative instance, the whole Gentile world in the person of that Syrian mother saying in beseeching tones: Come over and help us! On that hypothesis the reluctance to heal becomes very intelligible. In other circumstances Jesus might have granted the request without hesitation and without remark, viewing the case as a mere exception involving no principle. But in the actual situation He has to realize for Himself the serious import of what He is asked to do, and also, if possible, make it apparent to His disciples. To Himself He has to say: My mission was to Israel, is this a new call? To His disciples: You sympathized with the wish of the Galileans to make me King of a reformed Israel; do you know what the request of this woman which you seem inclined to back really signifies? It portends the transference of the Kingdom of God from Jewish to Gentile soil. What Jesus said to the woman may be interpreted in the light of the same hypothesis. "It is not permissible, or it is not meet, to take the children's bread, and to cast it to the dogs," said He with apparent harshness. Had she known the whole facts of the case, she might have replied: True, Master, but have the children not already got their bread, and have they not themselves thrown it to the dogs? Is that not the reason of your being here? That would have been an

argument difficult to answer ; yet her actual reply to Christ's objection served her purpose even better, revealing as it did a humble faith which went straight to His heart, and suggested the thought : the Pagans after all, not dogs, but children.

Jesus, it seems to me, used the case of the Syrophenician woman to give His disciples an object-lesson *on the claims of the Gentile world*. And the whole of that circular journey in Gentile lands would be an education to them on that subject, and probably was intended by their Master to serve that purpose. What He said to them we know not, but we can conceive what the world itself would say. "The sun shines here as well as in Galilee ; why may not the gracious love of the Father in heaven be here also ?" Or was that too abstruse a lesson in theology for them as yet to comprehend ?

The leading feature in the later incident of this journey is the curious details regarding the manner in which our Lord effected the cure of the deaf-mute. These are probably not to be regarded as an indication of Christ's habitual method of working cures, but rather as something peculiar to the individual case, and on that account deemed worthy of note by the Evangelist or the original reporter. The acts specified—putting a finger into each ear, and touching the tongue—were not means, but *symbols* of cure ; and perhaps we should find in their use on this occasion a hint that the disease itself had for the mind of the Healer a symbolic significance : physical deafness and dumbness an emblem of the spiritual condition of Israel, or possibly of the Gentile world. Thus may be explained the sigh which Jesus heaved in working the cure. It was a sigh not over the physical malady of an individual, but over the spiritual malady of a people—in Israel's case, alas ! not curable.

5. *The escape towards Cæsarea Philippi.*¹ The imme-

¹ *Matthew* xvi. 13 ; *Mark* viii. 27 ; *Luke* ix. 18. There is no indication of locality in *Luke*,

diat occasion of this new journey towards the north was the demand for a sign on the part of the Pharisees, which to our Lord appeared a thing of very evil omen.¹ As to its pædagogic purpose in reference to the disciples there is no room for doubt. If on the earlier journey by the way of Tyre, Sidon and Decapolis, Jesus sought to familiarize His disciples with the thought that the kingdom for whose coming they ardently longed might eventually pass away from Israel, during this later one His aim was to initiate them into the mystery of His own ignominious fate. The two subjects were closely connected. The events involved were related to each other as cause and effect. The rejection of Jesus would have for its necessary consequence the forfeiture by Israel of her privilege, the passing of the vineyard into other hands. Logically, therefore, the fate awaiting their Master should have been the first subject of instruction for the disciples. But it was by far the harder theme, therefore it formed the subject of the later lesson. It was a wide theme, with many aspects, as well as a hard one, and there is ground for believing that during the weeks taken up with the Cæsarea excursion it formed the leading topic of many an earnest conversation. With reference to a certain stage of the journey, Mark states that Jesus was teaching His disciples, and was saying to them: The Son of Man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill Him.² There was not merely an announcement, but a course of instruction. The fact was stated again and again, and made the subject of explanatory discourse, in which it was pointed out what causes were at work inevitably leading up to such a catastrophe, and how well the event predicted would correspond with Old Testament prophetic anticipations. The leaven of the scribes, of

¹ *Matt.* xvi. 1; *Mark* viii. 11.

² *Mark* ix. 31. The verbs represented in English by "was teaching" and "was saying" are in the imperfect, implying continuous action.

which the Master had bid His disciples beware,¹ would afford matter for much talk, as supplying in its evil nature a sufficient answer to the question: Why take so gloomy a view of the future? And the prophetic delineations of the sufferings of God's servants would receive their due share of attention as showing how likely moral fidelity and tribulation are to go together in this world. No fear of conversation flagging in the Jesus-circle in those eventful weeks.

The subject was first introduced on the way northwards towards Cæsarea Philippi,² and very appositely by a question which had, and was probably intended to have, the effect of eliciting from the disciples a declaration of their faith in the Messiahship of their Master. This faith was not the birth of the moment; it was really involved in the sympathy evinced by the disciples with the project to make Jesus King. Jesus desired now to draw them into a confession of their faith that He might set it in a new order of ideas. Hitherto their logical position has been: the Christ (shown to be such by word, deed, and spirit), therefore worthy to be Israel's glorious crowned King. The logic of the scribes, on the contrary, has been: deserving by his conduct to die, therefore his Christhood incredible. Jesus wishes His disciples to know that neither their logic nor that of the scribes is sound, and that the truth lies in the antinomy: the Christ, yet doomed to an ignominious death. What an abstruse lesson for these poor fishermen and publicans! No wonder they kicked against the goad. But there was no help for it. Both members of the antinomy were true, and neither could be seen in its full truth except in company with the other. What a tragic event the death of Jesus became when it was seen to be the death of a *Messiah*, and what a fierce light was thrown on the nature of Messianic dignities and functions when it was made clear that the destiny of a true Christ is to be crucified

Matt. xvi. 6; *Mark* viii. 15.

² *Mark* viii. 27.

by and for the world ! It is not surprising that Jesus took great pains to indoctrinate His followers in these high matters, making them the absorbing theme of conversation from this time onward. Only by much iteration could they be made intelligible. After all His pains the disciples had not learnt their lesson when the end came. But one thing they did understand then : that what *had* happened was what their Master had again and again said *would* happen ; and this helped to bring them safely through the crisis.

A. B. BRUCE.

PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS PETER AND
JAMES.

IT was not my intention to reply to the arguments advanced by Dr. Sanday in the *EXPOSITOR* for April. I do not like to thrust myself into the position of arguing against him. I am too conscious of my debt to him, both as a scholar from whom I have learned much, and as a friend who has given me sympathy and encouragement to attempt the problems of history, and accorded much generous recognition and praise to the little that I have done. It seemed better, and it was pleasanter, to drop the subject. But a letter from Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith (from whom on other occasions I have received very useful and encouraging communications) reminds me that there is another aspect of the situation. It is almost a betrayal of the truth to be silent at this stage.

To keep this subject rightly before the reader's mind, it must not be treated as isolated; it should not be discussed as if the real question were whether Dr. Sanday or I be right on this single point; it should be considered in its relation to the development of modern historical criticism. The "Tübingen theory"¹ was founded upon the discrepancy between *Galatians* ii. 1-10 and *Acts* xv., considered as descriptions of the same event. Starting from that evident discrepancy, and relying on the perfectly correct principle that the description given by the eye-witness Paul must be preferred to that given confessedly at second hand in *Acts*, it arrived by a singularly able and luminous argument, which seemed to compel assent inexorably at every step, at the conclusion that the discrepant and inharmonious narra-

¹ For brevity I use a rough and unscientific term to describe a class of views varying in many details, but having certain general characteristics common to all. The looseness of the term does not affect my argument.

tive in *Acts* xv. could not be the work of the friend, pupil, and year-long companion of Paul; that that narrative, and the book as a whole, showed such signs of knowledge of the real facts mingled with attempts to misrepresent and gloss them over, as proved it to be written in the second century by some one who desired to colour past history so as to suit later views and controversies.

On the other hand, scholars like Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday rightly conceived that the book of the *Acts*, as a whole, has the first-century tone: they caught the ring of genuineness in it, and they felt also that it was the unified work of a single author. In all this they showed true historical insight and literary feeling. I confess, and have always frankly acknowledged, that for years I was on the wrong side; I had a natural love for, and confidence in, a clear and definite chain of reasoning, in which one advanced by firm and easy steps; and I lacked either the sense, or the knowledge, or both, that could seize the tone of the book as a whole.

Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday were right in the most important parts of the problem; but their method of eluding the Tübingen argument from the discrepancy of *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii., by simply minimizing, or denying the existence of,¹ the discrepancy, was not, in my judgment, successful. But it was a great achievement to restore credit and authenticity to the work of an historian, whereas a wrong theory as to a single passage is a slight and venial error. That they upheld the right dating of *Acts* was an immense service to history, rendered at a time when the decided preponderance of learned authority was leaning in the other direction. Perhaps, if the alternative were now

¹ Lightfoot minimizes too far: Dr. Sanday, in his edition of *Galatians*, acknowledges its existence more frankly and definitely than Lightfoot, though in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 329, he does "not include among the number of serious difficulties the differences between *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii. They are no doubt great, but," etc.

presented to me between on the one hand accompanying them unreservedly, and on the other hand following the Tübingen direction, I should, as the least of two difficulties, now go with them. But my contention is that as that alternative is not presented, it is possible to follow them in the general question, and to eliminate the difficulty which they left.

In his earlier paper in February, Dr. Sanday "took the broad ground that *Gal.* ii. 1-10 implied a more advanced stage of the controversy than could have been reached about the year 46,¹ and before St. Paul's first Galatian journey."² In his second paper, with that fairness and honesty which characterize all his writing, he acknowledges that he stated his case "with rather too little qualification,"³ but he still thinks it impossible "that the situation of *Gal.* ii. could really have been reached by the year 46";⁴ and he still holds "that the language of St. Paul in *Ep. Galatians* is satisfied by nothing short of the events of the first missionary journey." He now derives his weightiest argument from *Galatians* ii. 7-9; and he

¹ I substitute always the date for which I contend. To do my theory justice, it must be taken as a whole and with its own date. Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem about Nov., 45, and the private communications took place naturally near the end of the visit.

² To the argument which I advanced to prove that in the case of Cornelius the antithesis of circumcision and non-circumcision was already fully developed (whereas Dr. Sanday had maintained that that antithesis, with the watchwords, "Jew" and "Gentile," began only in A.D. 50), it may be added that Peter and James in *Acts* xv. treat the case of Cornelius as conclusive and complete with regard to the relations of the Gentiles to the Church; they avoid using the term "circumcision," which was calculated to rouse ill-feeling; but their speeches imply that the antithesis of Gentile and Jew was explicit in the case. It may be said that they interpret the case in the light of later events; but, if there be anything in that, it is just as true of Paul in *Galatians* ii.

³ Considering that he had chosen the argument as being "in the strictly Baconian sense crucial," the admission is significant.

⁴ Acknowledging that some qualification is needed, he qualifies his position by the insertion of "really." Dr. Sanday is a master in the art of delicate gradation in strength of statement.

states his reason in the following words, which are so important for my purpose that I must beg leave to quote them.¹ "Surely this 'gospel of the circumcision' is something more than occasional [preaching to proselytes; and surely the acceptance of it is the ratification of a success already gained. It seems to me to point as clearly as anything could point to the events of the first journey, and the founding of the Galatian Churches . . . On this ground I take my stand. If I am dislodged from it, then it will be time to consider Prof. Ramsay's ingenious combinations. But, as it is, I am stopped at the threshold."

The reason why Dr. Sanday finds the sentiment of *Galatians* ii. 7-9 so impossible in the year 46 is not clear to me; much as I try, I fail to see where lies the difficulty, and Dr. Sanday never states it definitely. Apparently he holds that the Apostles Peter and James could not possibly recognise Paul as being called to the Apostolate of the Gentiles in 46, but could recognise him as such in 50 or 51 A.D. It may be granted that no human being, however obtuse or slow-witted he was, could fail, in A.D. 50, to recognise that Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles; but I see no difficulty in believing that men like Peter and James, after Paul had expounded to them privately his aims, his method, and his call, could have recognised his great mission as early as 46. Let us consider this point a little.

Were Peter and James men who could only recognise the logic of events? Were they men who could not feel Paul's greatness, recognise his mission, "know the grace that was given him" (*Gal.* ii. 9), until these had been demonstrated so effectually that no one could deny his command-

I leave a lacuna in the middle; but this does not alter the effect. I give the words selected by an unprejudiced onlooker, Mr. Boys-Smith, as representing Dr. Sanday's argument.

ing position in the Church? Dr. Sanday seems to assume their inability to do this in 46. I am far from agreeing with him. How did Peter and James gain their great position and influence in the early Church? Was it not that they earned it by their power, by their sympathetic insight into the qualifications of men, and by their appreciation of the needs of the Church, by "the grace that was given them?" And does not grace recognise grace intuitively? Is not the Divine naturally attracted to the Divine, wherever they meet? In great questions leaders grasp the situation and see the solution long before most people appreciate it. On my theory Peter and James were leaders.

But we have a history of the period, setting forth the critical steps in the development of the Church. What evidence does Luke give as to the recognition of Paul's charge to the Gentiles? As early as 42, or the very beginning of 43, when Barnabas went to Antioch, and saw the character of the congregation there, which contained a considerable proportion of Greeks,¹ he bethought himself at once of Paul, and went to fetch him to Antioch. He had come in contact with him only for fifteen days at Paul's first visit to Jerusalem in 35, and had since then heard of his successful work in Cilicia; but he knew at once that Paul was needed in Greek Antioch. Luke's conception clearly is that Barnabas had from the first recog-

¹ Dr. Sanday will not admit this argument, for he holds to the reading *Ἑλληνιστάς* for *Ἕλληνας*. In my view, the longer word makes the passage meaningless, and distorts Luke's whole conception of the development of the Church. An important step is here indicated: the preachers at Antioch went beyond those in Phœnicia and Cyprus, and even addressed Greeks. Now the preachers in Cyprus certainly addressed Hellenistai—how could they avoid it in the synagogues of Cyprus?—and Hellenistai had formed part of the Church in Jerusalem from the earliest times (*Acts* vi. 1; ix. 29). The character of the Antiochian Church is wholly misunderstood, unless we recognise that from the first it contained a considerable (and a steadily growing) proportion of Greeks; but they were Greeks who came into relations with the Jews, and the preaching was still regularly connected with the synagogue.

nised that Paul "was called by the good pleasure of God to preach Him among the Gentiles (*Gal.* i. 16).

It is apparent that Dr. Sanday's point of view is far removed from mine, as he says, p. 257, he "can only understand this (*Gal.* ii. 2) . . . of a practice which the Apostle had begun"; and again, he sees in ii. 7-9 "the ratification of a success already gained." On this the reader will judge. To me the view that Paul imparted to the leading Apostles beforehand the wider and freer plans which had been growing in his mind amid and through his work in Cilicia and Antioch, that he went forth to Cyprus, strong not merely in his private conviction of the reality of the Divine commission given him, but also in the consciousness that the great leaders, who stood in the eyes of the world as the pillars of the Church,¹ were in full agreement with him²—that view, I say, appears not merely a nobler conception of the mind of the three leaders, Peter, James, and Paul, but also one which is needed to explain Paul's attitude, his perfect confidence in the unity of feeling between Peter, and James, and himself, and his perfect confidence that the incident of *Galatians* ii. is a conclusive and final confirmation of his point of view.

Further, it was on account of private communication and intercourse (*Gal.* ii. 2) that James and Peter perceived the working of the Divine Spirit in Paul: private explanation was required in 46, but in 50 the Galatian Churches had made clear to all Paul's power and his mission. Paul represents that James and Peter came over to his side, and approved of him purely on account of his private statement of his gospel, and because "they saw the grace that was given him"; and he does not give the slightest hint that

¹ οἱ δοκοῦντες στήλοι εἶναι, *Gal.* ii. 9, where (as I have argued in the *EXPOSITOR*, Third Series, vol. ii. p. 106) it is a misapprehension, shared even by Lightfoot, that any depreciation is implied.

² On this see a paragraph near the close of this article.

their action was due to such striking achievements as the foundation of the Galatian Churches.

Contrast with the words of Paul in this passage the words of Luke describing the visit and action of Paul in Jerusalem in 50 A.D., after the Galatian Churches were founded: "they hearkened unto Paul and Barnabas, rehearsing what signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." We have here a distinctly later stage, as is clearly seen on a comparative view.

A.D. 46, GAL. ii.

ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ
κηρύσσω¹ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (v. 2).
ἴδοντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι¹ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
τῆς ἀκροβυστίας (v. 7). ἐνήργησε²
καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (v. 8). γνόντες
τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι (v. 9).

A.D. 50, ACTS xv.

ἤκουον Βαρνάβαν καὶ Παύλον ἐξηγου-
μένων ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ
τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι' αὐτῶν (v.
12). ἀνήγγειλαν ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν
μετ' αὐτῶν (v. 4).

In the later case the evidence is objective, and entirely based on accomplished fact, and on the marvels which attested God's action among the Galatian converts. In the earlier, the evidence is subjective, and based purely on the recognition by Peter and James of Paul's personal qualifications, the message entrusted to him, and the power and grace that were given him.

Parallel cases may be cited to confirm this comparative view. Wherever a Church has been founded amid a new class of persons, making an extension of the Gospel, the justification rests in the new Church itself, and in the signs of God's action among its members: so in the case of Cornelius's household (x. 45), "they of the circumcision which believed were amazed, because on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit: for they heard them speak with tongues."³ So again at Antioch, "when

¹ On the tenses κηρύσσω and πεπίστευμαι, which are vital, see below.

² On the sense of ἐνήργησε see below.

³ Compare the argument of Peter in defence, xi. 5-17, and its effect on his audience. See also my *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 115. At Pisidian Antioch

Barnabas had come and had seen the grace of God, he was glad" (xi. 23). So at Ephesus, Paul's question, when he "found certain disciples," was, "Did ye receive the Spirit when ye believed?" (xix. 1, 2). That was the one single sufficient proof, and it was also the necessary and indispensable proof: Paul could not omit it in *Galatians* ii. except for the one reason that there had yet been no opportunity for it. If the incident in *Galatians* ii. 1-10 had occurred in A.D. 50, the question would have been, "Did these converts receive the Spirit?" When Barnabas and he went up to Jerusalem in A.D. 50, they at once addressed themselves to that question.

Now Dr. Sanday, evidently, recognises fully that if the interview with Peter and James in *Galatians* ii. occurred in A.D. 50-51, Paul must necessarily have anticipated this question and appealed to the proof furnished by his Galatian converts; and he proceeds to discover it in Paul's words. So far as I may judge, however, it does not lie in the words, but is read into them by Dr. Sanday through his feeling that it must be there. He considers that in *vv.* 7-9 we have something that "corresponds exactly to that 'rehearsing of what God had done' among the Gentiles," which was given at Jerusalem in A.D. 50-51. I cannot see the correspondence, and I have therefore placed the critical words side by side on a preceding page, in order that the reader may judge for himself. But can the words in *v.* 9, "wrought for me also to the Gentiles," be taken as a "retrospect of work done" among the Gentiles?¹ That can hardly be maintained:² the conjunction of ἐνήργησε in

"the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit," xiii. 52; and this must be understood of all the Churches in order, as is confirmed by the marvels, *e.g.*, at Lystra, for such signs involve a reciprocal action (see my *St. Paul*, p. 39, lines 7-9).

¹ ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀπόστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὴν ἑθνην (*Gal.* ii. 9).

² I do not imply that Dr. Sanday maintains this: I quite believe that he would not think so; but it is well to bring out the point clearly.

9 and χάρις in 10 points beyond question to the parallelism between this passage and iii. 5 in regard to the sense of the verb. In iii. 5 Paul asks, "He therefore that bountifully supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miraculous power in you,¹ *doeth He it* by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" The allusion in both passages is to the indwelling God-given power, not to the resulting effects in external action. The two Apostles were aware of the power in Paul and the grace: Paul was aware of the Spirit and the God-given powers in the Galatians. Compare the note of Dr. Zöckler (whom I quote, partly because of the clear, precise words that he uses, partly because he is strongly on the opposite side from me in this question): "*nicht die äusseren Wunderaffekte, sondern die geistgewirkten Kräfte zur Vollbringung solcher Wunder (= χάρισματα, Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4) sind gemeint,*" iii. 5.

This sense of the verb ἐνέργησε is not likely to be disputed, and I need not go into an examination of Paul's use of the verb, and of the noun ἐνέργεια.² But I shall quote a few words from Mr. Boys-Smith, who treats this passage as conclusive in evidence against Dr. Sanday. He renders, "He that empowered Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, empowered me also for the nations"; and he adds the paraphrase, "He that commissioned Peter for the circumcision in the words, 'feed my sheep,' commissioned me for the uncircumcision, saying, 'I will send thee far hence unto the nations.'" He puts the force of ἐνέργεια well: "ἐνέργεια always stands for a spiritual force entering into the realm of human life, and operating within the person of him who feels its influence." And similarly,

¹ The Revised Version is admittedly seriously erroneous here. I have intentionally used Lightfoot's words in the translation given of ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν κτλ.

² The words are characteristically, but not quite exclusively, Pauline: they, with ἐνέργημα, occur a little over thirty times in N.T.

"the idea of ἐνεργεῖν is that of subjective activity, not of objective operation, the infusion of energy into the person, not the accomplishment by him of external results." The thought of ii. 8 is, as he says, actually expressed a few verses before (i. 15), "to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the nations." The parallel in ii. 8, 9, of ἐνίργησε and χάριν δοθεῖσαν is in itself a piece of evidence: the God-given power and grace stand on the same level.

We are, I think, forced to the conclusion that Paul describes himself in *Galatians* ii. 1-9 as convincing the Apostles privately that a Divine mission was entrusted to him, and that indwelling power and grace had been given him for that mission. Henceforth he knew that the leaders were with him, and all the arguments of the Tübingen school about disagreement between them and Paul are vain imaginings, vain as were the attempts of the extreme Judaistic party ("certain of the believing Pharisees," xv. 5) to effect any disagreement between them and Paul.

On the other hand in *Acts* xv. Paul appeals to results, to the practical effect of his mission, the outward marvels wrought in its course, and the conversion of the nations.

Galatians ii. is therefore the earlier stage; *Acts* xv. the subsequent stage.

In treating the whole passage, *Gal.* ii. 1-10, Dr. Sanday seems to me not to attend sufficiently to the force of the tenses (which I tried to bring out in an article in *EXPOSITOR*, Third Series, vol. ii. pp. 104 ff.). There is an extraordinary variety in the tenses used, and the variation is exceedingly significant; in fact the whole force of the passage depends on the use of the tenses. The series of events which took place at the time described are expressed by *aorists*: those ideas which are spoken of as true down to the moment when Paul was writing are rendered by *presents*. Hence v. 2, "I submitted (*aorist*) to the apostles

the gospel which I continue preaching now (*present*) among the Gentiles"; "to prevent the work of my whole life down to the present time (*present*) or my work then (*aorist*) from being ineffectual." But his commission to preach had been given to him before 46, and Paul therefore expresses it in the *perfect* tense, which here has the force of *pluperfect* (the tense of the direct speech being retained in the indirect according to a common grammatical form). When one follows the tenses closely, the historical interpretation for which I contend is seen to be necessary.

In saying that Paul in 46 submitted to the Apostles his mission and his commission and his aims among the Gentiles, I do not of course mean that he either spoke to them of, or even contemplated, all the development of events. Doubtless he looked forward, as Peter and James did, to a peaceful unification of Jews and Gentiles in the one Church, and it is certain that he would have been horrified to think of the breach with his own people that he was approaching. He saw, indeed, a serious danger threatening; but all three leaders agreed as to the best means of meeting it. Nor is it meant that he was already clear as to all his method: on the contrary, I think the scene in the proconsul's house at Paphos (xiii. 5 ff.) was a new step made on the inspiration of the moment.

Further, it is clear and certain that James and Peter, and also Paul, looked forward to the Gentiles, as they were converted, entering into relations with the Jews and observing those minor conditions of purity that would qualify them for doing so. A unified Church of Jews and Gentiles was possible on no other footing; and the Decree of the Apostles and Elders in A.D. 50-51 was merely a legal and formal expression of the action required to hold together the single Jewish-Gentile Church. Paul in his later development made only this modification, that he looked on these

conditions as being mere concessions to the weakness of the Jews, and not in themselves essential (except in so far as a moral principle was partially involved in some of them).

I touch only the ground on which Dr. Sanday has taken his stand in refusing even "to consider my ingenious combinations." Admitting my faults of disrespect in standing up against a scholar so much more experienced, to whom I ought to be a listener merely, I say with Themistocles, "Strike, but hear me." At present he uses the same kind of reasoning against me as has been employed already by some other scholars in regard to the South-Galatian theory. One single fact (or, as I should call it, one single mistaken pre-conception) is regarded as barring out my theory; and my arguments, "my ingenious combinations," are not even considered. This attitude is one which, I confess, I find it difficult to sympathize with. In ancient history, where disputed problems are so numerous, there is, as a rule, no safe and trustworthy method except that of weighing the case as a whole, contemplating it from all sides, and judging from the widest possible examination. It has been my experience, repeatedly, that the method of trusting to one apparently strong reason, and suffering oneself to be "stopped at the threshold" from weighing with a sympathetic mind a different theory,¹ betrays the scholar who follows it: an impression gained from one point of view is often deceptive. My chief aim in my previous article was to persuade Dr. Sanday to look at the subject from a new point of view before he pronounced judgment; but as yet he merely reiterates that he finds himself barred from doing so, and concludes by saying that he will not reply to

¹ It is not a fair hearing of a theory involving a delicate interpretation of historical evidence to begin with a strong prepossession on the other side; the judge is then practically a critic on the look-out for evidence on which to rest a condemnation; and the finest points of a theory are certain to escape those who do not study it with sympathy.

any arguments I may have to advance further—a promise from which I would gladly absolve him.

As to “the imputation of apologetic harmonizing,” which Dr. Sanday seems to consider that I have unjustly brought against him, such terms are liable to bear a different sense in the minds of different persons. I did not use the term or make the charge;¹ though I see no crime even if he had deserved it, and I see no reason to think that the distinguished scholar who is quoted on p. 262 is more free from the charge than he himself or Lightfoot is. Further, when Dr. Sanday asserts that he has not “given to the sacred writers any different measure from that which he would have given them if they had been profane,” I recognise no merit in his claim: rather, as a diligent and grateful student of his writings, I feel on every page that he does give a different measure, that it is inseparable from his nature and mind to do so, and that it would be unfortunate for the world, for his pupils, and for his readers, if it were not so. But it is quite consistent with this that he should be perfectly fair and just to all; and the first quality which attracted me in Lightfoot and also in himself was their manifest eager and limitless desire to be scrupulously honest and just in their judgments.

A brief reference is needed to Dr. Sanday’s argument on p. 261. He holds that *διακονίαν πληρώσαντες* in xii. 25 denotes simply the handing over of the Antiochian money to the authorities in Jerusalem; and quotes *Romans* xv. 31, where he holds that *διακονία* means only the presentation of sums to the authorities. His argument implies that the large representative deputation which carried those sums, was intended by Paul simply to go to Jerusalem, hand over the money, and depart. But surely that is a very inadequate conception: surely the same aim as in A.D. 45–46

¹ My charge was that he did not fully realize the force of an objection. If that is a charge of crime, what writer on these subjects is free from it?

(according to my view) was in Paul's mind. The deputation was to impress the Church in Jerusalem with its personal services; it was to hand over the money to the authorities (as in xi. 30), to be at their orders for service in connection with it, even though the opportunity of a famine was not open at the second visit, and to bring home to the mass of Christians in Jerusalem the reality of the Church in Lystra, Berea, etc. (and *vice versâ*). No such further service is mentioned by Luke, but Paul's capture disarranged all plans.

W. M. RAMSAY.

LIKE Prof. Ramsay, I had not thought to write any more on the subject in debate between us at present. But the invitation which he gives me is so friendly, and the opening which his article offers seems to me so satisfactory, and so really conducive to an understanding, not only between our two selves, but among those who are interested in the subject generally, that I have not hesitated to take him at his word, and I have asked the editor to allow me to append a few remarks to his paper.

It has unfortunately happened—I hardly know how—that besides the necessary and inevitable differences between us in regard to the interpretation of this section of Church History, others had gathered round them which did not seem to me so necessary, and which I am afraid must have encumbered our discussion to the reader. These, I am glad to think, have now nearly all been cleared up, and the one that remains may, I hope, soon be removed.

I can assure Prof. Ramsay that I had no wish to stand in the way of the full consideration of his case. If I proposed to restrict our discussion to certain lines, my motives in doing so were quite on the surface. Partly, they were a

very prosaic desire to economize time and space, and partly a certain mental habit which impels me whenever I can to simplify a complicated question by going straight to what seems to me the most vital part of it, where a decision once taken carries with it all the rest. Of course, I may have been wrong in singling out the part I did as vital. There are other considerations which I should myself have liked to take up when that had been disposed of. But as the question stood it seemed to me sufficient to deal with the one main point at once. That was all I meant by putting in my plea as it were *in limine*; it was a short cut to a decision, such as I am afraid one is obliged to have recourse to in this crowded life of ours, and nothing more.

I hope there was nothing unjust in this. It seemed to me that the particular question did admit of being isolated, that it did admit of a definite answer Yes, or No, and that the one general answer carried with it other subordinate answers. I am quite open to correction, and merely state my case for what it is worth.

However this may be, Prof. Ramsay has now been good enough to meet me on the ground of my choosing. I thank him for it, and I thank him for bringing to bear his unique power of giving to the details of a question definiteness and reality. There can be no doubt that his article is calculated to advance our debate a long step forward. I shall have no reason to complain if, when I have said my say, the votes are taken, and the decision goes against me.

Prof. Ramsay has stated his case, and I will say at once that I do not think it could be better stated. The view which he takes of clause after clause of the crucial passage seems to me (on his premises) the most reasonable that could be taken. If he should end by making a convert of me, I should myself take the same view. But I cannot say that as yet the argument, as a whole, seems to me convincing.

It is important that we should have the text of the passage (Gal. ii. 6-9) before us; and as some exception has been taken to my renderings (which I believe were usually those of the Revised Version), it may be most satisfactory if I adopt the paraphrase given by Prof. Ramsay himself (*St. Paul the Traveller, etc.*, p. 56).

"But from the recognised leaders—how distinguished soever was their character is not now to the point; God accepteth not man's person—the recognised leaders, I say, imparted no new instruction to me; but perceiving that I throughout my ministry am charged specially with the mission to foreign (non-Jewish) nations, as Peter is with the Jewish mission—for he that worked ($\delta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \varsigma$) for Peter to the Apostolate of the circumcision worked ($\epsilon \nu \eta \rho \gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon$) also for me to be the missionary to the Gentiles—and perceiving [from the actual facts] the grace that had been given me, they, James and Cephas and John, the recognised pillars of the Church, gave pledges to me and to Barnabas of a joint scheme of work, ours to be directed to the Gentiles, while theirs was to the Jews."

Prof. Ramsay thinks that these verses have reference to a point of time corresponding to that of Acts xi. 30 (the mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem with succour against the famine). This he would date in the year 46. I would rather place the events described in the epistle in the longitude of Acts xv., *i.e.*, about the year 50. The great difference between us is that on Prof. Ramsay's view the first missionary journey and the founding of the Galatian Churches (Acts xiii. xiv.) are subsequent to the situation implied by the Epistle, whereas on my view they precede it. I have maintained that St. Paul makes a direct appeal to the successes of the Galatian mission, and this Prof. Ramsay denies. The issue between us is, therefore, as clear and simple as possible, and it should not be difficult for the reader to make up his mind about it.

Prof. Ramsay rests his case mainly on the force of ἐνέργησε, which—as he rightly urges—is subjective rather than objective. When St. Paul says that God “worked for” him towards the Gentiles as He “worked for” Peter towards the Jews, the Greek lays stress rather on the powers implanted, the gifts and energies bestowed upon the two Apostles, than upon the results which they obtained. The inference drawn from this is that when we are told that James and Peter and John “perceived the grace” that was given to their colleague, they perceived it rather through their private intercourse with him and their “sympathetic insight into the qualifications of men,” than through the witness of events. Their confidence in St. Paul is prophetic rather than in retrospect of work done.

I should not think of contesting the perfect tenability of this as an interpretation of the Greek. At the same time I am a little surprised that Mr. Boys-Smith, who has expressed his adhesion to Prof. Ramsay’s view, should think it “conclusive” as against my argument. I note by the way that Prof. Ramsay can hardly have so regarded it at the time when he wrote his paraphrase. He inserts there the words which I have placed in square brackets (in the original they are in smaller type) “perceiving [from the actual facts] the grace that had been given me.” Perhaps his view has developed since the paraphrase was written. I do not mean to press the words against him further than to show how very naturally they are introduced, and how entirely the Greek admits of my construction of the history as well as of his. The words chosen no doubt lay stress on the God-given energies of the Apostles. But these might be inferred either directly or indirectly, either by personal contact and insight into character, or by the news of effects produced; the context leaves both methods open, and I should not wish to exclude either.

One little phrase at least makes for the wider reference. If St. Paul had written no more than "He who worked for Peter worked also for me," the working might well have been only inward. But then he adds "He who worked for Peter *to the apostleship of the circumcision* worked also for me *towards the Gentiles*." The appeal is transferred from the inward to the outward. It was the actual success of Peter among Jews, and the actual success of Paul among Gentiles that supplied proof of their endowment and fitness for their respective missions.

It thus appears that Prof. Ramsay was not wrong in inserting "from the actual facts," and that I am (so far) not wrong in following him. The next question that comes up is, What are these facts? The context seems to show that they are facts upon a certain scale, facts upon a considerable scale. When St. Paul ascribes to his brother Apostle "the apostleship of the circumcision," he implies, though he leaves the word to be understood, that "the apostleship of the Gentiles," had fallen to himself. What evidence had he of this?

Prof. Ramsay insists on a point which I had waived. He claims that the right reading in Acts xi. 20 is *Ἑλληνας*, and not *Ἑλληνιστάς*; he thinks that this proves the presence of Greeks (Gentiles) in some numbers in the Church at Antioch, and that St. Paul had exercised his ministry among these.

It is a dangerous thing in textual criticism to take at once the reading which seems to give the best *prima facie* sense, especially where that sense is required by a particular theory. Has Prof. Ramsay weighed the reading as a question of such difficulty ought to be weighed? The mass of MSS., including B, the Laudian Acts, and the important cursive 61, has *Ἑλληνιστάς*; a small but important group, the third hand of N, the first hand of D and A, have *Ἑλληνας*. The first hand of N has the clerical error

εὐαγγελιστάς. It is commonly assumed that Ν is really a witness for Ἑλληνιστάς, the first syllables being evidently due to the influence of εὐαγγελιζόμενοι which follows. It may, however, be urged (as it was by Prof. Warfield in the *Journal of Biblical Exegesis* for 1884, p. 114) that a substantive suggested by εὐαγγελιζόμενοι could only be εὐαγγελιστάς. The evidence of Ν* has to be taken with so much reserve, which in a case like this is not without importance. On the other hand, one of the two leading witnesses on the other side, A, is discredited by reading Ἑλληνας for Ἑλληνιστάς in ix. 29, where D is not extant, and therefore cannot be tested.

Into the scale in favour of Ἑλληνιστάς must be thrown the strong temptation to editor or scribe to substitute an easy and familiar word for one which was by no means familiar. There is no like temptation to set against this, so that the argument drawn from it seems to me a strong one. Generally speaking, textual considerations in the strict sense tell decidedly for Ἑλληνιστάς.

Are they overthrown by considerations of exegesis? I greatly doubt it. The words "Hellenist," "Hellenistic," etc., are with us in constant use; they occupy a convenient place in the language of scholarship, and a meaning has been attached to them which is well understood. This is apt to make us forget that the case was very different in antiquity. The three places where the word Ἑλληνιστής occurs in the Acts, and certain comments upon the Acts are said to be the only instances of its occurrence. It is not, I believe, found in the whole of Josephus, or in the whole of Philo. Hence the meaning of it is really far from certain. I suspect that it is to be taken strictly of the Jews who habitually used the Greek language. In the places where they are mentioned the Hellenists always seem to be in a minority. Even at Antioch they would be, although it is described as "a Greek city"; the main body of the Jews

would use their own Aramaic, which did not differ greatly from that of the native Syrians. We may suppose that only a few synagogues were set apart for the Jews who were in the stricter sense "Hellenists."

The Jews in these synagogues would doubtless be in closer touch with Gentiles; and I am ready to believe that there may have been at Antioch a certain number of proselytes or inquirers who had embraced Christianity as Cornelius did. But I am not prepared to think that these existed at Antioch in such numbers by the date of Acts xi. 30 that St. Paul could speak of himself as holding an *ἀποστολὴν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*. I cannot think that as yet there was a clear demarcation of spheres between himself and St. Peter. It seems to me an anachronism to speak at this date of *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας*. All these expressions would be perfectly in place after the first journey. I cannot think that they could be in place before it.

There are three great steps in a steady and gradual ascent. The handful of converts of Gentile birth at Antioch and St. Paul's dealings with them is the first; the scene before Sergius Paulus (Acts xiii. 8-12) is the second; the third and greatest is the definite turning to the Gentiles at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 46 ff.). This is the real turning-point. "It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." With these words St. Paul announced his assumption of the true "apostleship of the Gentiles." From this day onwards he may be said to preach a real "gospel of the uncircumcision." To use either of these phrases at any earlier period seems to me to antedate them; it seems to me to introduce confusion into a history the main lines of which stand out with wonderful clearness.

The two phrases, *ἀποστολὴ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* and *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*

τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, both seem to me to imply a certain scale in their contents — deliberate preaching, systematically directed over a considerable extent of time and with considerable results. I still fail to see that these conditions are satisfied by the view put forward by Prof. Ramsay.

I will only add a word of explanation in reference to the discrepancies which seem to arise if my view is adopted. Prof. Ramsay thinks that I minimize these, though I quite understand that the charge is not pressed, as my error is set down as a natural and pardonable consequence of my position as a teacher. I am grateful for the indulgence, but I am afraid that I cannot avail myself of it. What Prof. Ramsay would call a minimizing of discrepancies is with me a matter of deliberate principle, applicable equally to secular writings as to sacred. I would formulate the principle thus: Where we have reason to think that two writers are each singly deserving of credit, discrepancies between them are more likely to be apparent than real: even where the discrepancies may seem to be serious, and the methods suggested for resolving them are open to some objection, it is still better to accept the testimony than to discard it, because our knowledge is almost sure to be too limited to exhaust the possibilities of reconciliation. *Subtilitas naturæ subtilitatem sensus et intellectus multis partibus superat.*¹ I sometimes wish that a lawyer with competent knowledge would collect for us instances in which verdicts more or less confidently given had been afterwards, by the confession of the real culprit, or by the production of new evidence, proved to be wrong. I believe that if this were done, and if the instances in question were duly weighed, our ideas as to the possibilities of things would be considerably enlarged.

In the particular case before us I have little doubt that, as conceived by Prof. Ramsay, they are really too narrow.

¹ Bacon, *Novum Organum*, i. 10.

As at present advised, the sum total of the difficulties on my reconstruction of the history seems to me less than on his. I do not pledge myself to the whole of the reconstruction, but I think that there are certain fixed points in it; the filling up between those points is only put forward as speculative and conjectural. For the first I should contend somewhat strenuously; for the second I do not much care to contend. But I hope that Prof. Ramsay will believe that, even while I am arguing against him, I am weighing his case as well as I can, and that no mere obstinacy in debate will prevent me, if I am satisfied with it, from coming over to his opinion.

W. SANDAY.

“*THE SHORTENING OF THE DAYS.*”

“EXCEPT those days had been shortened,” says our Lord (St. Matt. xxiv. 22), “no flesh would have been saved : but for the elect’s sake those days shall be shortened.” The word which he uses is a somewhat singular one, etymologically. It seems to have been originally applied to cattle dishorned, or wanting horns, like the celebrated “polled” Angus breed. Thence to trees “pollarded,” or to anything else truncated or reduced to smaller dimensions. Whatever technical or special sense the word may have had, however, has disappeared by the time our Lord uses it. When applied to “days” it simply means “reduced,” “cut down,” “abbreviated,” from some period of longer duration. It cannot, however, be taken as equivalent to “short.” It distinctly implies that, according to some fitness of things, to some original design, the days were meant to have been longer, *would* in fact have been longer, if the mercy and goodness of God had not cut them short. It is a common thing, probably, to read the sentence as if it were but a picturesque way of saying that the dread period of the final sorrows would only be, thank God, a very brief one, otherwise the prospect would have been black indeed. But that does not do justice to the words deliberately used. They suggest clearly enough something like a Divine impatience in the Almighty, in virtue of which He cannot bear to let His elect go on suffering to the uttermost ; and I venture to think that this does really represent (so far as human expressions can) a law of the working of the Divine mind, which is love. That love anticipates its own victory ; it hurries on to the rescue, to the consolation, of the elect who suffer. I do not pretend for a moment to say *how* it works in that order of things which is foreseen and pre-arranged from eternity. I only claim, on the strength of

our Lord's words, to recognise it as an active element in the Divine mind as revealed to us in the New Testament. One remembers, of course, all the while that this revelation is not absolute, but is one of "economy" and adaptation—adaptation to the limitations of human understanding. What one looks to find are principles of the Divine working translated into human phraseology—phraseology upon which it would be manifestly rash to build up an edifice of inference and deduction. Nevertheless the principle indicated in the present case is an actual one, and the recognition of it does really explain some things which need explanation in the words and works of Christ.

Everybody must have been struck with the message of the angel (Matt. xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7): "Tell His disciples He is risen from the dead; and lo, He goeth before you into Galilee; *there* shall ye see Him." It is incomprehensible without some explanation. He had indeed told the disciples so Himself before His betrayal (Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28). The message was not untrue. But assuredly it did no justice to the truth—the truth so blessed and glorious for the disciples. They did not have to go into Galilee in order to see Him; they saw Him that very evening in Jerusalem; that very afternoon two of them saw Him on the road to Emmaus, a place which does not lie in the direction even of Galilee. Of course it is asserted by some that the angel's message represents the original tradition concerning the reappearance of our Lord, and that all the stories which we read in St. Luke and St. John and in the section appended to St. Mark about His appearing in Jerusalem belong to another and later and entirely inconsistent tradition. A theory so destructive may be set aside as useless for most of us: we must look in another direction for an explanation. Going back to our Lord's promise in Matthew xxvi. 32, we have to ask ourselves how He *could* have talked about meeting

them again in distant Galilee when He was actually to reappear in Jerusalem itself, and in that very upper room. Was it a subterfuge, an equivocation? Was He playing with them, as we sometimes do with children when we prepare some joyful surprise for them? God forbid. He meant it, without any reservation. If His reappearance was in fact nearer than He had said, it was due to the same Divine impatience which anticipates the hour of reunion, of consolation; which cannot delay to bind up the broken hearts, to set the captives free, to give unto them that mourn in Zion a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning; which shortens the days and cuts them down to hours for the elect's sake. Did He not know then? That is a question which I do not venture to answer with a direct negative; but I *do* venture to believe that He as man found it somewhere in the oracles of God that the risen Redeemer should meet His own again in Galilee. He knew *that*, and the angel knew it—and so they spake. But to Him risen, the Father's only-begotten Son, it was granted by the Father to prevent the hour of reunion for which He longed. As in answer to Abraham's intercession the needful number of righteous was reduced again and again, so in response to the desire of the Saviour's heart the days were shortened which should have separated Him from His own, and He saw them again that very evening.

If it be conceded that we have here the probable solution of a real difficulty, we may go on to apply it to a greater difficulty in the same general connection. The saying in Matthew xii. 40 is a stumbling-block to many for obvious reasons. Not indeed because it seems to assert the literal and historical truth of Jonah's incarceration in the whale, because that can hardly trouble any thoughtful mind for long. Supposing the story of Jonah to have been a poetic fiction, that would not have made the least difference. Un-

doubtedly our Lord refers to all the Old Testament stories as if they were literally true; and He could not have done anything else, being what He was. For Him to have gone out of His way to explain that Jonah was not *really* swallowed by a whale (supposing it to have been a parable of spiritual experiences) would have been as absurd and impossible as that He should have gone about explaining that the sun does not really rise or set, but only seems to. To imagine that our Lord *could* have taken such a line in any such case is to betray an inability to grasp the real meaning of the Incarnation. He did not become a Child of the nineteenth century in any other respect—in manner of speech, or manner of thought: how should He have assumed a nineteenth-century acquaintance with the results of scientific or literary investigation, which would have made it impossible for Him to deal simply and naturally with the men of His own age and race? Happily, this is generally conceded now.

But apart from this altogether, there is the obvious difficulty that our Lord did *not* remain three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The time-limits laid down by the Evangelists make it impossible. By no ingenuity can the statement be made even approximately correct. Commentators have much to say about the loose way in which the Jews calculated time; but to this looseness of expression there are limits, and the statement about three days and three nights falls far outside any limits that can be reasonably allowed. He was, in fact, two nights and one whole day in the heart of the earth. No person that ever lived, Jew or Gentile, ancient or modern, would describe that period as "three days and three nights." It is necessary perhaps to insist upon this, obvious as it is. It is one of the curious fallacies into which people often fall when they wish to play the apologist. They point out a certain tendency in writers of that age—to exaggeration, to

looseness of statement, to inaccuracy of quotation, and so on—and they seem to think that, once they have pointed out the tendency, they have sufficiently justified any instance (however monstrous) of exaggeration, looseness, inaccuracy, or whatever it may be. Thus, *e.g.*, there is in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (chap. xlii.) a misquotation and misapplication of Isaiah lx. 17, which is quite intolerable; and yet his apologists evidently think they have perfectly justified him, and re-established his authority as a teacher, when they have said that "accuracy of quotation was unknown in that age." That may be true, and ought to be allowed for. But obviously there is a degree of inaccuracy which was not permissible even then. And so as to statements of time. They were not so minutely correct as we make them now. But they could not be so incorrect as to leave "three days and three nights" equivalent to one day and two nights. We have therefore a real difficulty to face here.

Some good people solve it easily by regarding this verse as an interpolation which has crept in from the margin—a gloss added by some too zealous transcriber. It may be conceded that it has the appearance, on the face of it, of being of that nature. But there is not the slightest documentary evidence to support this assumption, and in the absence of such evidence it is difficult to discard a verse here or there because we do not like it. At any rate most of us will prefer any other reasonable explanation which may be offered us.

Putting aside therefore the two solutions spoken of above, which do not seem to solve anything, we have our Lord confronted with a downright misstatement. Let us consider how He was led to it. He had been claiming as His own "the sign of the prophet Jonah." He was to be to His own generation what Jonah had been to the Ninevites. Jonah had been a sign to the Ninevites, not, of course, in

respect that he had been aforetime swallowed by a whale (with which incident the Ninevites could not possibly have been acquainted), but in respect of his sudden and startling appearance, alone, unfriended, helpless, in their midst. They had been the cruel enemies of his people, and yet he came, at his own cost and risk, without fear and without hope of reward, to save them from wholesale destruction. Such had Jonah seemed to the Ninevites, such was our Lord to the world. His helplessness, His fearlessness, His Divine disinterestedness was the heavenly counterpart of Jonah's. Like Jonah He adventured Himself without any protection into the midst of His enemies, with words of solemn warning, with purposes of love and pity. Our Lord then recognised Jonah as a type of Himself in His mission. But He was led further than that. One cannot doubt from His recorded words (as in John xix. 28) that He scanned the Scriptures narrowly for indications of what was to happen to Him, and of how He was to be obedient unto death. These indications, so far as His resurrection was concerned, must have been found almost entirely in the *types*, and especially in the human types such as Isaac and Jonah. One may reverently believe that our Lord was led to take to Himself the latter type as foreshadowing the death and rising again to which He looked forward. Unquestionably Jonah in the story was as good as dead and buried; he was cut off from the land of the living; he was incarcerated in a living tomb; and from that tomb he emerged alive, by a wholly unexpected and unprecedented resuscitation. So He took the type to Himself as one of the prophetic anticipations of Holy Scripture, and declared that He, too, was destined to be three days and three nights withdrawn from sight and sound within the earth. I venture to suggest, with all reverence, that this was the mental process whereby our Lord was led to that declaration. He reached it through the Scripture, and by means

of His divinely illuminated, but still thoroughly human, reading and searching of the Scripture. How then shall we account for the fact that His declaration seemed to be falsified by the event? By that law of anticipation, that willingness of the Father to shorten the days for the elect's sake. His words were not literally fulfilled for the same reason that those other words of His about meeting the disciples in Galilee were not fulfilled—not, I mean, in what they obviously implied. The days could not have been "shortened" unless there had been some normal and original term (so to speak) of separation and of sorrow to be superseded and cut down by the working of the Divine love. "According to the Scriptures" (may I say?) He was due to spend three nights and three days in the underworld. So it was written of the type, and the Scripture must be fulfilled, and hence arose a kind of antecedent measure and necessity of things; but, in fact, the Father raised Him up very early on the third day. The days were shortened for the elect's sake, for the sad and broken-hearted disciples' sake; ay, and for *His* sake, that He might the sooner, the more illustriously, be declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.

It will no doubt be objected to the position here taken that it implies a certain divergence between our Lord's expectation of things and the actual event. Taking His words as the only real indications of what He thought, I venture to believe that He *did* expect to remain for three days and nights in the tomb, and *did* expect to rejoin His disciples in Galilee. That is inconsistent with the belief commonly entertained that, by virtue of His Divinity, He knew all things with an infallible certitude. But the only possible line of advance in our knowledge of our Lord's human life and mind is found in the study of the Gospels as they are, apart from any preconceived notions. It is

absolutely useless to begin with the assumption, *e.g.*, that He *could* not have been mistaken about anything. The question is simply, "Have we any real evidence in the Gospels themselves that He was? and if He was, may we go further and trace the origin and nature of the mistake?" Taking the Gospels as they stand, I have pointed to two instances in which our Lord's predictions about Himself were (in a sense) incorrect. In one of these the prediction was clearly connected with our Lord's recognition of Jonah as a type of Himself. Apparently it grew immediately out of that recognition. In both instances our Lord's own anticipation was falsified in a happy and blessed sense by the working of a Divine principle which He Himself declared, whereby it pleases the Father to anticipate the appointed end, and to shorten the days for the elect's sake. Again, I say the days could not be "shortened" unless the length of them had in some way been fixed—a length which could be reduced by the tender pity of God. And how could the days be fixed for our Lord unless it were in the Old Testament Scriptures, for which He showed so profound a veneration? It was from these Scriptures that He argued the *pre-established necessity* for all His own sufferings as the Christ (Luke xxiv. 26). It was from them that He anticipated even the details of His passion (Matt. xxvi. 24, 54, 56; John xix. 28). The natural conclusion is that as man He was left, with special illumination, no doubt, of the Holy Spirit, to gather His own destinies, and to form His own anticipations, from the Old Testament Scriptures. That these anticipations were once and again falsified by the event was due to the fact that, while God is always as good as His word, He is sometimes even more good. He shortens the days for His elect.

R. WINTERBOTHAM.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE substantially identical reprint in 1895 of *The Prophets of Israel*,¹ published in 1882, illustrates the irreparable loss we have sustained through the death of Prof. Robertson Smith. Had he lived, this volume would no doubt have been enriched by the fruits of subsequent research in the same way as the new edition of *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. As it is, "with a few trifling exceptions, about which no well-informed editor could have the least doubt, the form of the Lectures remains unaltered"; as to the notes, "to a large extent the additions consist of references to recent works." The more important supplements are on Amos v. 26 (Sakkuth and Kaiwan), p. 402, and Dr. Cheyne's rejection of the current identification of "So, king of Egypt" (2 Kings xvii. 4) with Shabaka, p. 428. In an introduction of fifty-two pages, Dr. Cheyne indicates the differences between the critical position of *The Prophets of Israel* and that now held by the critical school of which Dr. Cheyne is the chief English representative,—Dr. Driver may not be wholly identified with it. To these critical differences we shall return in considering another work. Dr. Cheyne considers that in a revised edition Prof. Robertson Smith would have assigned to editors many passages which *The Prophets of Israel* treats as the genuine work of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah. This is probably true. Often the work of 1882 seems to accept disputed passages as part of the original text rather by an otiose assent than by a deliberate judgment; and the

¹ *The Prophets of Israel to the Close of the Eighth Century B.C.*, by the late W. Robertson Smith, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. New Edition, with Introduction and Additional Notes by Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. London, A. & C. Black, 1895, pp. lviii. 446. 10s. 6d.

whole trend of the author's critical movement was towards more advanced positions.

Dr. G. A. Smith's new work¹ more than sustains the great reputation he attained by his exposition of Isaiah. We need not say that he has fully utilised the results and suggestions of recent research, especially with regard to the criticism of Amos, Hosea and Micah. Scholars will be grateful for the contributions which this volume makes to the discussion of such topics, but we venture to suggest that these discussions should have been strictly confined to the notes. Dr. Smith himself seems to have had misgivings on the subject, and a highly technical paragraph, occupying pp. 358, 359, is printed in small type, presumably that it may be skipped without difficulty. There is urgent need that immense spiritual value of the principles and results of modern Biblical scholarship should be brought home to average Christians; this volume is peculiarly fitted to minister to that end, so that we grudge any concessions to the tastes of scholars that may repel those who are not experts. The exposition proper is in Dr. Smith's usual lucid and forcible style. The characteristics of each prophet stand out in bold relief, and are not obscured by any attempt to treat each minor point in detail. A complete translation is given to each book, and often the prophet is simply left to speak for himself—see for instance pp. 417, 418 on Micah v. 5-15 and pp. 426-429 on Micah vi. 9-vii. 6. The translation for the most part is exceeding vigorous and idiomatic, but occasionally Dr. Smith uses a kind of Hebrew in English words, which we believe, from its prevalence in similar translations, is supposed to illustrate and commend Hebrew language and ideas to the English reader. Surely

¹ *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, by George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Vol. I.—Amos, Hosea and Micah, with an Introduction and a Sketch of Prophecy in Early Israel. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896, pp. xviii. 440. 7s. 6d.

such a master of style and expression is not reduced to phrases like "hunt up to know the Lord," p. 344, "I will pass upon her neck," p. 345. Probably these are oversights and may be classed with the spellings Amaleq, Aharon, Qir (p. 142, elsewhere Kir), the citations of chapter and verse according to the Hebrew instead of the E.V., on p. 368, and the sentence about "ethical movements" on p. 158, where there seems to be some curious misprint. On the other hand, the translation "leal love" for *hesed*, E.V. "mercy," is used constantly; a mere Southron cannot pronounce on the sense of this phrase, but it has an awkward sound. Another feature of the translation is specially valuable; where the existing Hebrew text is unintelligible, the reader is made aware of the fact by a blank in the translation. This is a great improvement upon the practice of giving an ingenious but unsound translation in the text, with a statement in a note that the passage is obscure. Similarly on Hosea xii. 12-24 Dr. Smith writes frankly: "I cannot trace the argument here." Such caution materially increases the reader's confidence in the author's candour and judgment. Turning from these details to another main feature, the prophetic teaching is applied to modern times with great aptness and force.

We may now pass to the different sections of the book. The sketch of early prophecy includes a very striking rehabilitation of the ecstatic prophecy. Speaking of the authority of these prophets, Dr. Smith writes, p. 16: "Where such opportunities were present, can we imagine the Spirit of God to have been absent—the Spirit who seeks men more than they seek Him, and as He condescends to use their poor language for religion must also have stooped to the picture-language, to the rude instruments, symbols and sacraments, of their faith?" This sentence is worth pondering; it represents an important tendency of current thought. Dr. Smith also expresses a feeling that

makes many students dubious as to recent critical conclusions, when he says, p. x., that one of the defects of previous criticism is "the depreciation of the spiritual insight and foresight of pre-exilic writers."

In the case of *Amos*, and, indeed, also of *Hosea* and *Micah*, the prophet's personal character and history are sketched with great ability and sobriety. The author makes free use of his recent researches in sacred geography. As to *Amos*' message, the morality in which he was so intensely interested, was one already recognised by the conscience of Israel, p. 99; but "*Amos* denied that *Jehovah* was bound to save His people, he affirmed that ritual and sacrifice were no part of the service He demands from men. This is the measure of originality in our prophet," p. 103. On these two main themes accordingly Dr. Smith chiefly dwells. Upon the former he bases, pp. 153-155, a most impressive warning—too long to quote and not admitting of abbreviation—that the moral and social iniquities of Christian civilisation may lead to its being overthrown like that of Israel. He speaks of Israel in the time of *Amos* as a vigorous community, wealthy, cultured and honestly religious, in settled peace and growing power; and points out that this prosperity was the immediate antecedent of ruin. The treatment of *Amos*' denunciation of ritual is fairly summarised in his own words, p. 159, "In chap. ii. *Amos* contrasted the popular conception of religion as worship with God's conception of it as history."

Dr. Smith holds that *Hosea* actually had an adulterous wife, but that *Hosea* i. 2, "*Jehovah* said to *Hosea*, Go, take thee a wife of harlotry," etc., is an expression of the fact that "*Hosea* . . . pushed back his own knowledge of God's purpose to the date when that purpose began actually to be fulfilled, the day of his betrothal. This, though he was all unconscious of its fatal future, had been to *Hosea* the beginning of the word of the Lord. On

that uncertain voyage he had sailed with sealed orders," pp. 238 f. We may also note the views held on other interesting details. The well-known passage (vi. 1-3), "Come let us return unto the Lord, for He hath torn, and He will heal us," etc., is the mere expression of a "too facile repentance," which God receives "with incredulity, with impatience," pp. 263-265. We suppose that, in spite of R.V., the rabbinical translation of *qeçeph*, which gave us the striking comparison of the Israelite king to foam upon the water, must be abandoned. Dr. Smith gives us *chip*, which is certainly more graceful than R.V.Mg. *twigs*, but still leaves much to be desired. x. 14 is understood as a threat: "From the hands of Sheol shall I deliver them? From death shall I redeem them? Nay, let death and Sheol have their way. 'Where are thy plagues, O death? Where thy destruction, Sheol?' Here with them. 'Compassion is hid from mine eyes.'" Dr. Smith expounds with special care, as the main teaching of Hosea, the prophet's insistence upon knowledge or experience of God as an essential feature of religion; his setting forth of the Fatherhood and Humanity of God, and his analysis of Repentance. Of the last he writes, "Between him and ourselves almost no teacher has increased the insight with which it has been examined, or the passion with which it ought to be enforced," p. 333. These words are carefully weighed and can doubtless be justified, but they might be taken to mean that Hosea's treatment of repentance was exhaustive, and has not been materially supplemented. Here, as elsewhere, the impression may be made on some readers that our author's applications of prophetic principles were present to the minds of the prophets. This impression would often be mistaken; nevertheless such applications are perfectly legitimate. Inspired utterances necessarily carry with them consequences far beyond the speaker's original meaning, so that in applying ancient

revelation to modern needs, Dr. Smith is entirely justified in attempting something more than a mere reconstruction of the spiritual consciousness of Hebrew seers. For instance, if the reader strictly limits the connotation of the term by the context, the word "evangelical," p. 339, may well be applied to Hosea's preaching, because it insists on the Divine love as a ground of repentance. The exposition of this subject is singularly strong and beautiful, and often very representative of current thought; *e.g.*, "The love of God has the same weakness which we have seen in the love of man. It, too, may fail to redeem; it, too, has stood defeated on some of the highest moral battle-fields of life. God Himself has suffered anguish and rejection from sinful men," p. 351. We have travelled far since the time when Patripassianism was a deadly heresy.

In the last division of the book, we have an eloquent exposition of *Micah's* mission and message as the prophet of the poor; this is the keynote of the whole division and not merely of the chapter which bears that title.

We will now briefly notice the critical views of this volume and compare them with those of Dr. Cheyne in his introduction to the *Prophets of Israel*. First, however, we note that (p. 8) Obadiah, in its present form, is exilic; Joel is of uncertain date, but the great probability is that it is late. Hence Joel and Obadiah, with Jonah, are left for subsequent volumes. With regard to Amos, Hosea and Micah, Dr. Smith recognises that there are later additions. He discusses disputed passages with great fairness and moderation, and fully recognises that decisions on such points are often probable rather than certain. On p. 61, Dr. Smith gives a list of suspected passages in Amos: (1) References to Judah—ii. 4, 5; vi. 1 *in Zion*; ix. 11, 12. Of these ii. 4, 5 was defended by Robertson Smith, but is rejected by Dr. Smith and Dr. Cheyne. (2) The three

Outbreaks of Praise—iv. 13; v. 8, 9; ix. 5, 6. These also were defended by Robertson Smith and are rejected by Dr. Cheyne. Dr. G. A. Smith thinks the evidence is not decisive either way. (3) The Final Hope—ix. 8-15, this is accepted without discussion by Robertson Smith, but is rejected by Dr. G. A. Smith, and still more unhesitatingly by Dr. Cheyne. (4) Clauses alleged to reflect a later stage of history—i. 9-12; v. 1, 2, 15; vi. 2, 14. Dr. G. A. Smith is mostly uncertain about these passages; they are not referred to by Dr. Cheyne. (5) Suspected for Incompatibility, viii. 11-13. Dr. Smith accepts verses 11, 12, and decisively rejects 13; Dr. Cheyne accepts the latter and rejects the former. To Dr. Smith's list we must now add i. 2 and v. 26, which are also rejected by Dr. Cheyne. The disputed passages—mostly phrases and single verses—in Hosea are too numerous to be all noticed. We will follow Dr. Cheyne in noticing eight, all of which he regards as later additions. Six are references to Judah; both critics agree in rejecting i. 7, iv. 15, viii. 14; Dr. Smith is doubtful about vi. 11-vii. 1, and i. 10-ii. 1, and is inclined to accept the phrase "David their king" in iii. 5. He accepts v. 15-vi. 4—"genuine" in his statement of Dr. Cheyne's views, in note to p. 264, must mean genuine prayer, not genuine composition of Hosea—and the prophecy of restoration in xiv.

"With regard to the Book of Micah," says Dr. Cheyne, "it is becoming more and more doubtful whether more than two or three fragments of the heterogeneous collection of fragments in chaps. iv.-vii. can have come from that prophet," p. xxiii. Dr. G. A. Smith directly challenges this statement, and shows that a considerable body of critical opinion still maintains the substantial integrity of the Book of Micah, which he himself also accepts. He does not, however, deny the presence of interpolations in the text, *e.g.*, apparently, iv. 1-5 (= Isaiah ii. 2-5), and

more decisively, iv. 6, 7; and vii. 7-20 "is a cento of several fragments from periods far apart in the history of Israel." But interesting as this work is to the critic, we must emphatically reiterate that it will delight and edify every reader who can understand and appreciate straightforward English. When Dr. G. A. Smith expounded Isaiah, the prophet secured an audience for the exposition, now the expositor has to obtain a hearing for the prophets.

W. H. BENNETT.

THE HISTORY AND METHOD OF PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

THE history of the Pentateuch controversy is a long and changeeful one, even though we overlook its earlier pages. Nevertheless, if it be true of this history as Cicero asserted of all history,¹ that it is "the witness of the ages and the light of truth," then even its beginnings ought not to remain unnoticed. It is accordingly the purpose of the following pages again to call attention to these earliest stages of Pentateuchal criticism.

Philo and Josephus appear to have been still unaware of any discussion on the Pentateuch. At any rate, both of them assumed that Moses had written even the last eight verses of Deuteronomy. The most important of the interesting words in which they set forth this opinion are as follows: Philo writes in the *Life of Moses* (3, 39), "Most wonderful of all is the end of the sacred literature (*i.e.*, the Pentateuch), which, as in the case of a living creature, is the head of the whole legislation. For when he (Moses) was already withdrawn, and standing at the very end of his course, at that moment, being inspired with Divine ecstasy from above, while still alive, he declared accurately as a *Prophet* the circumstances following his death, *viz.*, that he had ended his earthly course (although he was not yet dead) and that he was buried, without any one being present, etc." Josephus (*Antiq.*, IV. 8, 48) writes thus: "Moses in the sacred books wrote that he had died because he was afraid lest men exaggerating his achievements, should dare to assert that he had withdrawn into a state of Divine being (*πρὸς τὸ θεῖον*)."¹ Philo's idea

¹ Cicero de Oratore, II. 36. "*Historia (est) testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriæ, magistra vitæ, nuntia vetustatis,*" etc.

therefore is that Moses as Prophet was *able* to describe his final earthly experiences, while Josephus held that Moses described his own death and burial out of modesty in order to prevent his own apotheosis. According to their actual language, it is clear that neither of these writers knew anything of a Pentateuch discussion. At the same time do not their expressions offer the suggestion that even in their days the question as to the original author of the last section of the Pentateuch had actually been raised? We shall not be surprised therefore to find that in the Talmud the existence of this question is assumed, inasmuch as, without being expressly stated, it meets at once with a reply.

Such is the case in the Talmud *Bababathra*.¹ After a discussion on the arrangement of the Old Testament books, it runs: "And who wrote them (these books)? Moses wrote his book, and the Parashe upon Balaam (the section, Num. xxii.-xxiv.), and (the book of) Job. Joshua wrote his book and eight verses which are contained in the Torah." The reference is to Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5-12. In the discussion arising out of this text, the following statement is made to establish the decision which had been given in regard to these eight verses. "It is impossible that Moses was alive and wrote (at the identical time), 'and there he died.' But Moses wrote up to that point; from that point onwards Joshua. These are the words of Rabbi Judah (the Holy, the editor of the Mishna), or, as others say, of Rabbi Nehemiah. Rabbi Simeon said to him, 'It cannot be that the law was lacking in a single letter, seeing that it is written (Deut. xxxi. 26), *Take this book of the Law*; rather *up to that point* was the Holy One (blessed be He) speaking and Moses writing, (and) *from that point* was the

¹ Fol. 14b, 15a. Cf. Marx-Dalman, *Traditio rabbinorum veterrima*, 1884. The further contents of this important passage will be found translated and discussed in my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament, mit Einschluss der Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.* (1893), pp. 445 f., 458.

Holy One (blessed be He) speaking and Moses writing *in tears.*'"

Some light is thrown on the inference drawn by Rabbi Simeon from the words, "Take this book of the law," by the fact that in *other* books of the Old Testament the account of the death of the particular author is not ascribed to *himself*. Thus it is stated further on in this section of the Talmud, "Joshua wrote his book, and (= but) whereas it is written, 'And Joshua, the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died' (Josh. xxiv. 29), *that* was added by Eleazar. Again, whereas it is written, 'And Eleazar, the son of Aaron, died' (Josh. xxiv. 33), *that* was added by Phinehas and the Elders. Again, he (the authority for the passage of the Talmud under discussion) has said, 'The Lord Samuel wrote his book,' and (= but) whereas it is written, 'And Samuel died' (1 Sam. xxviii. 3), *that* was added by Gad the Seer and Nathan the Prophet." It is clear that in these passages, which are *wholly analogous* to Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5 ff., the opinion was not maintained that the account of each particular person's death was recorded by himself. We cannot, therefore, be surprised if Rabbi Simeon's conclusion, from Deuteronomy xxxi. 26, that *Moses had related his own death*, found no defender in the following centuries.

The narrative of Moses' death, his burial, and his unique position in the roll of the prophets (Deut. xxxiv. 5-12) was therefore the first element in the Pentateuch which was established as a post-Mosaic *addendum*. It is further related that about the year 900 a Jew, Isaac (ibn Jashûsh) denied to Moses the words, "These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. xxxvi. 31).¹ This Isaac

¹ The identity of the Jewish scholar, so often named only "Isaac," with Isaac ibn Jashûsh, is accepted by Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VI. 47, and also by S. Poznanski, *Mose ben Samuel ha-Kohen, etc.*, 1895, p. 28, note 6.

stated his opinion upon Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff. more definitely thus, that this section was written in the time of King Jehoshaphat. This special dating of the section referred to may have given to Ibn Ezra († 1167) the occasion for the sharp judgment upon Isaac which he expresses in his Commentary on Genesis (contained, for example, in Buxtorf's edition of the Rabbinic Bible). He adds satirically that this writer was well called Yizchaq, *i.e.*, "Laughter," since he was laughed at by every one who heard him. It little became Ibn Ezra to condemn the other so severely. For he himself acknowledged in the first place (on Gen xii. 6) that the remark, "and the Canaanite was *then* in the land," shows that Canaan had been wrested out of the hand of another, and that, if it were not so, then a mystery lay upon the word "then," concerning which a man of prudence would hold his peace. Further, in commenting on Deuteronomy i. 1, he pointed out as singularly mysterious elements in the Pentateuch the words, "as it is said to this day," etc. (Gen. xxii. 14), and "stands not the bed of King Og in Bashan?" etc. (Deut. iii. 11). Finally, Ibn Ezra explained Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5 thus, "As far as I know, the fact is that Joshua wrote what follows." Isaac Abrabanel also († 1508), in his commentary on the Pentateuch, found it strange that "this side of Jordan" is several times written instead of "on the far side of Jordan" (Gen. i. 11 ff. ; Deut. i. 1, 5; iii. 8, 20, 25, etc.).¹

Outside Judaism also it was the narrative of the death of Moses, in the first place, which gave occasion for subtracting from the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch. Such was the case in the third of the twenty Clementine Homilies belonging to the second century A.D. (cf. § 47). According to this authority, Moses wished to propagate

¹ All these passages in the Pentateuch and many others are fully discussed in my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, with reference to all recent opinions and criticisms.

the early religion by word of mouth alone, and entrusted the law to seventy wise men. But after his death the law, contrary to his intention, was written down, and the Pentateuch was the result. That this written Pentateuch is not to be derived from Moses himself is clear from the narrative of his death (Deut. xxxiv. 5). In later times also the Pentateuch was frequently destroyed, and re-written with additions. Some knowledge of these Jewish-Christian views may also have reached the ears of Celsus, so that he held the view which Origen ascribes to him, that "the Pentateuch does not come down from Moses, but from some other persons" (*Contra Celsum*, iv. 42). A touch of criticism of the absolute Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch may be found also in the remark of Jerome to Helvidius, "Whether you call Moses the originator of the Pentateuch, or Ezra its renovator, I reject neither."¹

These words contain an echo of the statement, which must not be overlooked (Ezra vii. 11, 14), that Ezra came out of Babylon in order to teach commandments and statutes in Israel, and that in accordance with the law of his God "which was in his hand" (which he brought with him). Even in the mediæval Church, in which so many older traditions had been overrun with later ones, Nicholas of Lyra († 1340) in his "*Postillæ Perpetuæ in Biblia*" on Deuteronomy i. 1, does not suppress the suspicion arising from the fact that Moses had handed over the law to the Levites (xxxii. 9), and yet the Pentateuch continued further.

Nevertheless, as it was in general the main work of the Reformers to lead men back to the oldest historical sources, so it was their task to bring again to remembrance those points of tradition which bore upon the origin of the Pentateuch. The first word came from that theologian before

¹ The entire series of statements relating to this subject in the Talmud, etc., and in the Fathers (Clem. Alex., Iren., Tert., Hier., Aug.) ("Ezra restored again the law which had been burnt in the Temple archives by the Chaldæans") is printed in my *Einleitung*.

whom Luther took the oath when in 1512 he received the degree of Doctor of Holy Scripture. In his book on the canonical writings (1520) he said (§ 81)¹: "It is certain that Moses gave the law received from God to the people, but to whom belong the wording (*dictio*) and the core of the narrative (*orationis filium*), that is open to doubt." He added further (§ 85), "The position can be defended that Moses was not the author (*scriptor*) of the five books, because after the burial of Moses we find the same narrative-core (*orationis filium*) but not the same Moses." If one were inclined to treat Carlstadt as a solitary case, one should remember that Luther also, in the lectures on Genesis, which he delivered in the last years of his life (1536-1545) used these words: "It is a question whether these kings lived before or after Moses; if they lived after Moses, then this cannot have been written by him,² but must be an addition (*additio*) made by another, such as we find in the last section of Deuteronomy. For Moses did not say concerning himself, 'There arose not another after Moses with whom God spake face to face' (Deut. xxxiv. 5-12), nor that other word concerning the grave of Moses, etc., unless indeed we say (*nisi dicas*) that by the help of the spirit of prophecy he foresaw and foretold these things." Further, Petrus Palladius, "faithful hearer, and true disciple of Luther and Melancthon," the first evangelical writer of an Introduction to the Old Testament,³ declared that the name "Book of Moses" might very well be meant to express that these books had Moses for a subject.

¹ *Carlstadtii libellus de canonicis scripturis*, reprinted in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847.

² "*Non potuit ipse haec scribere.*" By the indicative Luther expresses his own judgment. By the conjunctive which he uses once he indicates an opinion which was not his own. How the question raised by Luther is to be answered, whether those Edomite kings in Genesis are to be placed before or after Moses, is discussed in detail in my *Einleitung*, p. 160 f.

³ Concerning its author and its interesting history, see the whole passage which is quoted from Walter, *Officina biblica* in my *Einleitung*, p. 6.

But beginning from the 16th and 17th centuries, several scholars of the Roman Church also have expressed themselves in similar terms. For example, Andreas Masius wrote in the preface to his commentary on the Book of Joshua, which was published at Antwerp in 1574 (p. 2): "Vain and false (*futilis commenticiaque*) is the opinion of the ancient Jews, which they have left in their Talmud, concerning the author of their holy books. I at least am prepared to assume that Ezra, either alone or in concert with contemporaries who possessed remarkable piety and learning, being breathed upon by the heavenly spirit (*afflatum*, referring to Ezra), compiled (*compilasse*) not only the book of Joshua, but also the book of Judges, the book of the Kings, and other books of the holy Bible out of various annals which had been preserved among the congregation of God. Nay, indications may easily be pointed out which show that the work of Moses which is called the Pentateuch, was both stitched together (*sarcitum*) and made clearer long after the time of Moses by the interpolation of words and clauses (*interjectis saltem hic illic verborum et sententiarum clausulis*). For, to mention only one such suggestion, Cariath-arbe is often called Hebron (Qirjath-Arba, Judg. i. 10; Hebron from Gen. xiii. 18 onwards), and nevertheless important (*graves*) authorities relate that this name was attached to the town by Hebron, the son of Caleb." In like manner the Jesuit Bonfrère also wrote in his *Pentateuchus Moysis commentario illustratus ab Jacobo Bonfrerio*, Antwerp, 1625 (p. 93): "In Numbers xxi. 14, 15, a 'book of the wars of the Lord' is quoted, and reference seems to be made to narratives which were written in this book of events which took place after the death of Moses. I will readily admit that the last chapter (the whole *ultimum caput*!) of Deuteronomy was not written by Moses himself, but was added by another, whether this was Joshua or Ezra (!), supposing that Moses himself had not, as Philo and

Josephus would have it, written thus concerning himself before his death (*scripsit, conjunct. !*). Numbers xii. 3 appears incompatible with the modesty of Moses (*a Moysis modestia alienum*).¹ That the name of Hebron was given to the town by Caleb's son is held by many not without reason. 'Dan' is mentioned from Genesis xiv. 14 onwards, and yet this name was given to the town long after the death of Moses (Judg. xviii. 29). But there is nothing to forbid the assertion that these and other small sentences of a like character were subsequently (*postea*) inserted in their several places by the writers of sacred books (*ab hagiographis scriptoribus*), and that only the body (*corpus*) of these books, with the exception of those few portions which were added later, was shaped (*efformatum*) by Moses."

Although we have traced the history of Pentateuch investigation only as far as the seventeenth century, it is plain that the controversy was not the fruit of caprice, and that it did not spring in a moment out of a single head. Rather is it the case that in the course of the centuries, with long breaks intervening, expositors alike of Jewish and of Christian persuasion, whose points of view were otherwise far apart, nevertheless in like degree detected traces which drew attention to the fact that Moses did not write the whole of the Pentateuch as it lies before us.

Now that the glance at the past history of Pentateuchal investigation which has been here afforded has established the results just described, that history need be pursued no further for the present, however rich be the materials at my disposal for its further development. But I must add to this historical portion of my paper what I may call a systematic portion.

¹ Bonfrère probably understood Numbers xii. 3 with the Vulgate: "And the man Moses was the meekest beyond all men who were upon earth" (*Mitissimus super omnes homines*); more accurate would be "extraordinarily meek (*ânâw*), more than all men," etc.

Still more important than a glance back at the history of the investigation is an examination and testing of certain fundamental presuppositions of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch. For, to take an example, it is always worth while to raise anew the question, whether an investigation of the external development of the Pentateuch, as we have it, is at all possible in view of the condition of the text, and if this question can be answered in the affirmative, whether in the next place the *linguistic* characteristics of the Pentateuch provide a trustworthy basis for a judgment upon the literary origin of the books.

The first question of all runs thus: Does the text of the Old Testament, which we have received, possess qualities which warrant us in regarding it not only as at least relatively well preserved, but also as permitting us to reach back to the original sources on which it rests? In answer to this question I would direct attention in the first place to something which lies outside the Pentateuch. In the historical section (2 Kings xviii. 13–chap. xx.) it is found that the name of Hezekiah occurs five times in the shorter form *Chizqiya*, and twenty-nine times in the longer form *Chizqiyyahu*. Now, are these two forms mixed one with another throughout this section? No, the five cases of the shorter form are all in 2 Kings xviii. 14–16; while the twenty-nine of the longer form are found in xviii. 13, 17 ff. down to chap. xx. Now it happens that the historical section (2 Kings xviii. 13 to chap. xx.) is also included in Isaiah xxxvi.–xxxix., but *these three verses* (2 Kings xviii. 14–16) in which the shorter form *Chizqiya* occurs five times, are wanting in the parallel (Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix.)! Their absence from Isaiah already marks these three verses as a section standing by itself; this section has had a separate existence, and a fate of its own, since just these three have not been taken up into the book of Isaiah. These three verses present the narrative of another source, and the same

three verses, and *only they*, in contrast to the foregoing and the following narrative, contain the shorter form of Hezekiah's name. This is a fact of far-reaching significance. It proves not only that the presentations of a historical event in separate sources are distinguishable from one another by linguistic differences, but also that these distinctions of form have been preserved in the handing down of the text.

The same can be shown by means of a large number of other passages. Passing over the linguistic distinctions between the historical books with which Chronicles runs parallel, and the Book of Chronicles itself, I will further allude only to formal peculiarities of the prophetic books. I adduce only the following. The expression "rising up early," *i.e.*, "earnestly," occurs in Jeremiah vii. 13—"I, God, spoke most earnestly to you," 25; xi. 7; xxv. 3, 4; xxvi. 5; xxix. 19; xxxii. 33; xxxiv. 15; xxxv. 14, 15; and xlv. 4; and yet opportunity for the use of this expression might well have occurred to other prophets also, *e.g.*, Ezekiel. Again, the word-series "sword, famine, pestilence" is employed: Jeremiah xiv. 12; xxiv. 10; xxvii. 8, 13; xxix. 17, 18; xxxii. 24, 36; xxxviii. 2; xlii. 17, 22; xlv. 13. The same series is found in Ezekiel vi. 11; vii. 15*b*; and xii. 16; but other arrangements are *peculiar to him*, v. 12, 17; vi. 12; vii. 15*a*; and he employed this threat altogether less frequently, cf. xiv. 13, 17. Again, "to drive the people into exile," is in Jeremiah *hiddiach*, viii. 3; xvi. 15; xxiii. 2, 3, 8, 12; xxiv. 9; xxvii. 10, 15; xxix. 14, 18; xxx. 17; xxxii. 37; xl. 12; xliii. 5; xlvi. 28; xlix. 25, 36; l. 17, and *hediach*, li. 34. In Ezekiel this word is found in iv. 13, but for the same idea also *hêphis*, combined with *zara'* (scatter), cf. xxix. 12; xxx. 23, 26. For a final example, "to deliver the impenitent Israelites to a curse," is a phrase of Jeremiah xxiv. 9; xxv. 9, 18; xxvi. 6; xxix. 18; xlii. 18; xlv. 8, 12, 22; xlix. 13,

Jeremiah and Ezekiel have a linguistic peculiarity in common in the second person singular of the perfect, ending with the old dialectical termination *i*. This form appears in other parts of the Old Testament: (? Judg. v. 7) Ruth iii. 3 f.; 2 Kings iv. 23 (story of Elisha; Central Palestine); Micah iv. 13; Jeremiah ii. 20, 33; iii. 4 f.; iv. 19; xiii. 21; xxii. 23; xxxi. 21; xlvi. 11; Ezekiel xvi. 13, 18, 20, 22, 31, 36, 43, 47, 51. This gives proof also that the linguistic form of the Old Testament has not been smoothed down. But Ezekiel, on his side, also has a considerable number of linguistic peculiarities; for example, frequent cases of the infinitive with the feminine termination (v. 6; viii. 6; xv. 4; xvi. 55; xxii. 3; xxvii. 10; xxxiii. 12; xxxiv. 11), and also infinitives terminating in *uth* (xxiv. 26), or, as in Aramaic, with *m* prefixed (xvii. 9; xxxvi. 5). In the same prophet we find also the plural termination *in* (Ezek. iv. 9; xxvi. 18), a further indication of the influence of some popular dialect of Aramaic character. This prophet describes his experience of a Divine impulse with the phrase, "The hand of the Lord was upon me" (i. 3; iii. 22; x. 8; xxxvii. 1; xl. 1). The Israelites are described by him, and by him alone (except Isa. xxx. 9), as a "a rebellious house," "a house of stubbornness" (ii. 5, 6, 7, 8; iii. 9, 26, 27; xii. 2, 3, 9; xvii. 12; xxiv. 3). Finally, in Ezekiel the prophet is addressed by God as "Son of man" (ii. 1, etc., about ninety-two times).

All these formal peculiarities of Ezekiel might have been employed by Jeremiah also, and, what is of chief importance, might have been transferred from one book to the other by later editors and transcribers. The fact that this did not take place is a proof that the transmission of the Old Testament text was, to a very high degree, conservative.

The very same characteristics of the text are made

manifest if the remaining books of the Old Testament are compared with the Pentateuch; and finally, if the separate parts of the Pentateuch are compared with one another. For example, the plural termination *in* is found as follows (taking the Hebrew books in reverse order): Daniel xii. 13; Lamentations i. 4; Job iv. 2, etc. (thirteen times); Proverbs xxxi. 3; Ezekiel iv. 9; xxvi. 18; Micah iii. 12; 2 Kings xi. 13; 1 Kings xi. 33 (2 Sam. xxi. 20, *k'thib*); Judges v. 10; but not in the Pentateuch. Or take the pronunciation of the preposition *min* as simple *me* before the article. This appears most commonly in Chronicles (eight times), in Ezra five times, and so through the Old Testament back to Judges (five times) and Joshua (five times), but in the whole Pentateuch, on the other hand, only once (*meha'oph*, Gen. vi. 20); and even in this case the Samaritan Pentateuch gives the form *min*. Or take the expression *hēkhal* for temple, "House of Jehovah." It occurs in Chronicles (eight), Nehemiah (three), Ezra (three), and so on back to Kings (eleven times). It is used also in 2 Samuel xxii. 7 and 1 Samuel i. 9; iii. 3; that is to say, in the period before the building of the Temple. But in no single case has it been carried back into the Pentateuch. It would have been still more natural if a name of God, which was quite common in one part of the Old Testament, had been inserted into the other parts in its later editions; but the Divine name "Jahve Sebaoth," which appears frequently from 1 Samuel i. 3 onwards (in Samuel eleven times), has nevertheless in no single case been carried over into the book of Judges, Joshua, or the Pentateuch; and that in spite of the fact that the use of the name "Jahve" itself suggested the addition of "Sebaoth," while many passages of the Pentateuch actually invited its insertion; e.g., Exodus xii. 41 f., where the subject is the hosts of the Lord, or Exodus xv. 3, where Jahve is glorified as God of war. But we can

point also to the converse, namely, that a linguistic phenomenon which is common in the Pentateuch, is absent from the later writings of the Old Testament. For example, I have observed that the repetition of the time-measure, as in "nine hundred years and thirty years" (Gen. v. 5), occurs forty-one times in the Pentateuch, but that this formula is used *for the last time* in 1 Kings vi. 1. It is never used in the countless enumerations which follow this passage in the Old Testament, not once in Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, or Chronicles!

Further, *within* the Pentateuch itself, the Mount of lawgiving is always called Horeb in Deuteronomy (i. 2, 6, 19; iv. 10, 15; v. 2; ix. 8; xviii. 26; xxviii. 69; *exception* in the poetical passage, xxxiii. 2). Never called Sinai in Deuteronomy, this is the name it bears in Numbers x. 12; ix. 3; iii. 1; i. 1, and Leviticus xxvii. 34; xxvi. 46; xxv. 1, and never Horeb. (On Exodus, see my *Einleitung*, p. 170 f.) Or take the expression for "eleven." Compounded with "*ashtë*," which has been discovered again in Assyrian, it occurs Exodus xxvi. 7, 8; xxxvi. 14, 15; Numbers vii. 72; xxix. 20, but only once as an ordinal number in Deuteronomy (i. 3). Compounded with *achad(t)*, it occurs in Genesis xxxii. 33; xxxvii. 9; Deuteronomy i. 2. (These passages include *all* those in which "eleven" appears in the Pentateuch).¹ Again the expression for "beget" is provided by the stem *jalad* in Genesis iv. 18 (three times); x. 8, 13, 15, 24, 26, *i.e.* throughout one whole chapter, where, on the other hand, the derived stem *hōlîd* is not once used. But the latter form is used in Genesis v. 3 f., 6 f., 9 f., 12 f., etc., to v. 30 f.; and also in xi. 10, 11, 12, etc., to v. 26. Thus *hōlîd* also is found in whole chapters which do not

¹ "Eleven" *outside* the Pentateuch is = *ashtë 'asar (esrê)* 2 Kings xxv. 2; Jer. i. 3; xxxix. 2; lii. 5; Ezek. xxvi. 1; xl. 49; Zech. i. 7; 1 Chron. xii. 13; xxiv. 12; xxv. 18; xxvii. 14—but = *achad 'asar (achat 'esrê)* Josh. xv. 51; 1 Kings vi. 38; 2 Kings ix. 29; xxiii. 36; xxiv. 18; Jer. lii. 1; Ezek. xxx. 20; xxxi. 1; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5, 11. See further my *Einleitung*, p. 230 seq., and my *Lehrgebäude*, II., p. 211 seqq.

show a single case of *jalad*. (The other cases are tabulated in my *Einleitung*.) In like manner, the name *Elohim* occurs thirty-five times in Genesis i. 1-ii. 3, *Jahve* not once. On the other hand, in the narrative section iv. 1-16 *Jahve* occurs eight times and *Elohim* not once. (Further particulars in my *Einleitung*.) In connection with these peculiarities of expression also, it is not only the fact of their existence which is of importance, but yet more, that they *have been preserved* in the transmission of the text. And the authority of the Hebrew Old Testament is confirmed in regard to the last-mentioned distinction by the Samaritan Pentateuch. Concerning the Divine names *Elohim* and *Jahve*, I find there up to Exodus vi. 4 only the following divergences: *Jahve* appears instead of *Elohim* in cc. vii. 9; xxviii. 4; xxxi. 9, 16; and conversely *Elohim* for *Jahve* in cc. xiv. 22; xx. 18; Exodus iii. 4. Over against the unanimous testimony of many hundreds of passages of Genesis in the Hebrew and Samaritan texts (excepting the few cases just mentioned) the witness of the Hellenistic Old Testament cannot claim a hearing. The force of *its* testimony is further weakened by the peculiarity it displays in the use of the Divine names. For after moving in conformity with the Hebrew-Samaritan text in regard to the thirty-five cases of "*Elohim*" in Genesis i. 1-ii. 3, the Septuagint diverges in chap. iv. thus: for "*Jahve*" in v. 1 it gives *ὁ Θεός*, but in v. 3 *Κύριος*, in v. 4 again *Θεός*, in vv. 6, 9, 13, 15, *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, and in v. 16 once more *Θεός*. Here it is easy to ascertain which is the original. For in the Hebrew and in the Samaritan Pentateuch we have the consistent use of the Divine names in combination with other characteristics in the presentation of these sections. Further, the Samaritan Pentateuch, which otherwise diverges so often from the Hebrew and *agrees* with the Septuagint, would not conversely agree with the Hebrew and diverge from the Septuagint in regard to the Divine

names, if this agreement did not rest upon the original wording. (A thorough examination of the significance of the LXX. and the other old versions for the history of the text will be found in my *Einleitung*.)

It follows from the proofs already adduced that an affirmative answer may be given to the first of the preliminary questions raised above, viz. : whether the traditional text of the Old Testament has been preserved in at least relatively good condition, and specially, whether it admits of any inference being drawn as to sources which may underlie it. The traditional Hebrew Old Testament possesses in poetry, oratory and prose, and again in the several books of history an endless number of linguistic peculiarities, which might easily have been smoothed away, *if* later generations had set out on such an undertaking of assimilation. Now, since this has *not* been the case,—since, for example, the linguistic form of *Chronicles* diverges in the most striking features from the form of *Samuel* and *Kings*, the proof is provided that the Old Testament text, at any rate, offers a basis for the investigation of its literary origins by means of the formal peculiarities of its several parts.

The second preliminary question in Pentateuchal investigation which I intended to raise, is this : whether the linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch actually afford a trustworthy ground-work for conclusions as to its genesis and development. This question also can, I think, be answered with sufficient certainty by the aid of the material presented above.

I select, for example, the above-mentioned distinction of usage between *jalad* and *holid*. The former is used exclusively throughout Genesis x. (the “table of the nations”), and the latter in the whole passage, Genesis xi 10–26 (genealogy of the Semites). I once held a correspondence concerning this distinction with the late Professor Dillmann, with whom I had been intimate since the time of my

Ethiopic studies. He wrote to me, and afterwards published in his Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua (1886, p. 664) that those who used *hōlid* for "beget" wished to express the idea *more definitely*. But how can we say that those who used *jalad* of the man did not wish to express with perfect definiteness *aliquem generasse*? The narrator in Genesis iv. 18, who three times used *jalad* for "beget," evidently intended to express the idea just as definitely as the narrator of v. 3 ff., where *hōlid* is used. Dillmann appears to me, moreover, to have overlooked a passage like Psalms ii. 7, where the same word *jalad* is used for "beget." When, however, he says, in the passage above cited, that the "doctors of the law" would have preferred the expression *hōlid*, it is not easy to perceive how an ordinary writer sufficed for the register of the descendants of Japhet, Ham and Shem, in Genesis x., where only *jalad* is used, whereas a "doctor of the law" was required for the register of Shem's descendants in Genesis xi. 10-26. Another solution of the problem of the varying usage of *jalad* and *hōlid* will be found if we examine the actual usage of the whole Old Testament in reference to this distinction. This I have done in my *Einleitung*. One can observe there how the linguistic usage gradually tended towards a preference for the derived stem, *hōlid*. In the choice between *jalad* and *hōlid* it is not therefore a question of definiteness or indefiniteness, but of an advancing progress in linguistic usage.

That this development in Hebrew usage did actually take place, may be seen from what has been remarked above concerning the repetition of the measure of numbers (*e.g.*, "nine hundred years and thirty years"). This repetition occurs in the Pentateuch thirty-three times, then not till 1 Kings vi. 1, and after that not once again. On the other hand, we have Vav consecutive with the lengthened imperfect in the Pentateuch only in Genesis xxxii. 6; xli.

11; xliii. 21; and Numbers viii. 19; but in the memoirs of Ezra (vii. 27–ix. 15) in vii. 28; viii. 15, 16, 17 (twice), 23 (twice), 24, 25, 26, 28, 31; ix. 3 (twice), 5, 6. We must also bear in mind that in regard to the use of the two forms *anokhi* and *anî* for “I” the historical books of the Old Testament stand thus to one another. The books of Samuel contain about fifty instances of *anokhi* and about fifty of *anî*. In Kings the proportion of the two forms is as 9 to 44, in Ezra as 0 to 2, in Nehemiah as 1 to 15, in Chronicles as 1 to 30. The same progress of linguistic usage shows itself in the prophetic books; for the proportion of *anokhi* to *anî* is in Amos as 10 to 1, in Hosea (more Central-Palestinian) as 11 to 10, in Jeremiah as 37 to 53, in Ezekiel as 1 to 138, in Daniel as 1 to 23, in Haggai as 0 to 4, in Zechariah (cc. 1–8) as 0 to 8, and in Malachi as 1 to 5. The complete series, with references to all the passages in all the books of the Old Testament, will be found in my *Einleitung*, where I have also shown fully how the Decalogue, the Book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, and the other main sources of the Pentateuch, are related to each other in respect of their usage of these forms.

In order to give at least one proof out of the domain of Syntax I select the following example. In the expression, “supposing that,” or “in case that” (*ki*, *'asher*) “a man does so and so,” the natural arrangement which places the *conjunction* first, and not “a man, etc.,” is found in Exodus xxi. 7, 14, 20, 28, 33, 35, 37; xxii. 4, 6, 9, 13, 15. Thus in the Book of the Covenant this order is universal, “in case” or “if” any one. The same arrangement meets us in Leviticus xx. 9; in Deuteronomy xix. 11; xxii. 13, 28; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 1, 5, 7. On the other hand, *the other arrangement*, “a man, etc., in case (or if) he” is used in Leviticus i. 2; ii. 1; iv. 2 (not *vv.* 13, 22); v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 21; vii. 21; xii. 2; xiii. 9 (and—with a complication in so

far as the antecedent noun is not in the nominative but had to have a preposition before it; *casus absolutus*—Lev. xiii. 2, 18, 24, 29, 38, 40, 42); Leviticus xv. 2, 16; xix. 20 (xx. 10-21, again with this complication); xx. 27; xxi. 9 (17), etc., in the *Law of Holiness*, e.g. xxiv. 19; xxv. 26, 29; then after this *corpusculum juris* still further xxvii. 2, 14; Numbers v. 6, 12; vi. 2; ix. 10; xix. 20; xxvii. 8; xxx. 3. The same arrangement of words is found, however (apart from the somewhat different case in Micah v. 4), in Ezekiel (ii. 5) xviii. 5, as also in the Mishna, "a bridegroom, if he" (*Berachoth*, ii. 8; also iii. 6).

In this way the second also of the two questions raised above is answered. It has been shown by means of some plain examples that the Hebrew language of the Old Testament is no exception to the fate of other languages, in consequence of which they have undergone a more or less rapid change in regard to their accidence and their syntax.

The proofs which have now been offered establish in the main the following three points:—

(a) Particular sections of the Old Testament, e.g., the special narrative-source in 2 Kings xviii. 14-16, are distinguishable from other narratives on linguistic grounds.

(b) These distinctions have been preserved throughout the transmission of the text.

(c) The distinctions as regards form in the Old Testament make it possible to recognise a history of the Hebrew language.

Beyond this I am able, on the ground of exhaustive observations, to add that the ascertainable history of the Hebrew language *runs parallel* to the development of other languages in regard to sounds, forms and syntax.

My *Syntax of the Hebrew Language* will illustrate this in connection with the nomenclature and the use of the accusative with the full light of historical and comparative

philology. If the question be now asked, what conclusions may be drawn from all this for the investigation of the Pentateuch, I must refer to my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. For I have no right, any more than another, to publish elsewhere the contents of that book.¹ Only one thing I would still add. Let no one confuse literary criticism with the negations derived from *Religionsgeschichte*. For it is a misfortune that the two things are not always properly kept apart. Let it not be forgotten also that I have sought one side of my life-work in defending a truly transcendental Revelation, and that I have written a book "against the evolutionary theorists."

ED. KÖNIG.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

VIII. YOUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN.

WE return to the first Escape and to the *Teaching on the Hill*. Up there on the mountain top Jesus is alone with His chosen disciples enjoying a welcome season of recreation away from the sweltering heat and the crowds of the lake margin, and finding rest in a change of occupation. The Preacher and Healer now becomes the Teacher initiating His scholars into the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. Heaven's peace reigns in the hearts of Master and scholars alike the while. It is for all a sacred, blessed holiday. The holiday mood is traceable throughout the recorded sayings of the Master during this season of repose; the tranquillity of the uplands, the neighbourhood of the skies. In some parts of the discourse, especially, *e.g.*, the Beatitudes and

¹ Therefore it must suffice to remark that, if the facts which I have here referred to be properly weighed, they will be found, I believe, to support many of the *literary* conclusions which critics have reached respecting the different sources of which the Pentateuch is composed, and the dates to which they are to be referred.

the admonition against care, there is a divine simplicity, a lyric beauty, a light-hearted buoyancy that charm us, and tend for the moment to transform us into citizens of the kingdom, and elevate us into the upper regions of celestial tranquility. Here we have a chance of seeing into the very heart of Jesus. Of course it is but a glimpse that is now attainable. For an elaborate study of the Teaching on the Hill this is not the place. But we may form a slight acquaintance with the Master's thoughts concerning God, man, and the true life of man. The first of these three related topics will engage our attention in this paper.

Christ introduced into the language of religion a way of speaking concerning God which was new—if not absolutely, at least in emphasis and import. He called God *Father*. "Your Father which is in heaven." But He did not, as perhaps we might have wished, offer any formal definition of the sense in which He used the name. He defined simply by *discriminating use*, employing the name in connections of thought which invested it with special significance. He used the title in this way sufficiently often to invest it for the minds of His disciples with a rich net-work of associated qualities furnishing a firm support to religious faith, and a powerful stimulus to right conduct. It occurs some fifteen times in the "Sermon on the Mount," as reported by Matthew, so that by the end of the sermon hearers must have come to the conclusion that the Speaker did not employ the term "Father" mechanically as a customary expression, but of set purpose and with conscious deliberate preference. It would be instructive to study exhaustively the settings of the name in the various places where it occurs. This cannot be done now. It must suffice to indicate briefly what can be learned concerning the Father in heaven from the most representative texts.

Two very outstanding texts occur in the fifth chapter, verses 16 and 45. In both the name is introduced to

suggest a motive to conduct inculcated upon disciples. "Let your light shine" because thereby your Father will be glorified. "Love your enemies" because by so doing you will be like your Father, who blesses all, evil and good, just and unjust. In this use of the name the nature of the Divine Fatherhood is supposed to be known. But the same texts may be utilised as an aid to the better knowledge of the Fatherhood. While the name suggests the motives, the motives in turn throw light on the name. It is the light so thrown we are concerned with now.

In the first of the two texts the motive suggested implies that God values the honour brought to Him by those who let their light shine. No man can act on the motive unless he believes that God is not a being indifferent to conduct, but rather one who takes an earnest interest in the moral behaviour of men. This then is one thing Jesus would teach when He calls God Father. It is His fundamental lesson connected with His first recorded use of the name in His public ministry. He says in effect: "God is your Father, you are His sons, and your Father would have you behave worthily as His sons. He taketh pleasure in such behaviour not merely because of the honour it brings to Him through its influence on the minds of other men, but for its own sake. His eye rests with complacency on all who acquit themselves in the world as true children of God." This doctrine is consonant to the relation between father and son. A father expects honour from a son, and is deeply disappointed when he does not receive it. "If I be a Father, where is mine honour?"¹ And the honour every right-minded father most values is right conduct. Filial courtesies are well in their way, but it is *character*, a life true, pure, earnest, manly, noble, that can alone satisfy the paternal heart. Of a son living such a life every father worthy of the name is proud.

¹ *Mal.* i. 6.

To this statement the Father in heaven is no exception. He delights in all who in the sense of the preacher let their light shine. Who then are they? They are men of heroic temper; men who love truth with passion and will speak it come what may, and hunger after righteousness, and will do it at all hazards. That means that they are men who have anything but an easy time of it in this world, whose temptation therefore is to hide their light and suppress their convictions to escape toil and trouble. It is indeed by way of warning against yielding to this very temptation that Jesus utters the counsel, "Let your light shine." He has just spoken in a parabolic way of what men do with natural lights: "Neither do men light a lamp and put it under the bushel," thereby hinting to disciples, "Put ye not your light under cover, set it rather on the stand, where it can be seen." Men are tempted to hide their light when letting it be seen exposes them to danger, to loss of name, property or life. It is easy to show our light when it will bring honour and profit to ourselves. It is when there is neither profit nor honour going,¹ at least for ourselves, that we are sorely tempted to suppress conviction and comply tamely with evil custom. And the most powerful aid to resistance of the temptation lies in the knowledge that in yielding to it we miss the opportunity of glorifying our Father in heaven. For the fact is even so. It is one of the sure laws of the moral order of the world that glorifying God and self-glorification are mutually exclusive. The circumstances which give you the golden opportunity of glorifying God are just those which afford the least chance of obtaining immediate glory and advantage to yourself. Contrary-wise, when you are pursuing eagerly your own honour and interest and succeeding very well, be sure that the amount of honour you bring to God is very insignificant. It matters not that your work is within the technically religious sphere, and that you pretend to be very zealous for God's glory.

The moral heroes of human history, the pioneers of good causes, the warriors who fight a good fight for truth and justice, risking limb and life in the battle, the prophets, the martyrs, the confessors—these are the men who let their light shine. These are the sons of God. These are the glorifiers of the Father's name, and in these the Father glories. Such are the men the Teacher on the hill has in view throughout His discourse: the men who have been persecuted for righteousness sake (v. 10), the companions of persecuted prophets (v. 12), the men who, through no faults of theirs, have enemies to love, and persecutors to pray for (v. 44). And by using the name Father for God for the first time in this connection He throws an important light on the nature of the Divine Fatherhood, thereby teaching that God delights in moral heroes, and regards them *par excellence* as His children.

This is a very noteworthy doctrine. It is, *e.g.*, far in advance of that taught by Jewish doctors of the law, who set forth God to their disciples as one whose approval rested on those who studied well and carefully kept all the legal traditions. What a difference between the Father God of Jesus and the law-giving God of the Rabbis! The God of the Rabbis demands justice, the God of Jesus delights in magnanimity, going far beyond what can be legally claimed. The model man of legalism is one who in respect of the commandments great and small (especially the small) is blameless. The model man of the Teaching on the Hill is one who not only lives correctly but is ready to sacrifice himself for the good of others, however thankless the task. Blessed of God, said the Rabbi, is the faultless man. Blessed of the Father in heaven, said Jesus, is the self-sacrificing, devoted, heroic man. Note, further, how far this doctrine rises above the vulgar notion that God's favour is revealed by outward prosperity. That view would oblige us to regard the noblest men that ever

lived—the sages, prophets, apostles, and saviours of the race—as men accursed of God. Jesus has taught us a worthier way of thinking. “Those,” He says, “are the *Sons* of God in whom He delights.” A curse indeed rests on their life, but it is the curse not of God but of a world which in its ignorance and wickedness shuns the light and resents all earnest attempts to establish the reign of righteousness. This curse rests on My own life, as will more and more clearly appear; but because I willingly bear it for the world’s good, therefore doth My Father love Me and account Me His well-beloved Son.

Passing to the second text, we find the Fatherhood of God referred to in it as a motive to *magnanimity*. Here, again, the motive throws light on the name. Our inference is that magnanimity is a characteristic of God. But we are not left to infer this. That God deals magnanimously with men is expressly declared when it is said that “He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.” This magnanimity is an essential feature of the Divine Fatherhood. It is *as a Father* that God dispenses benefits to good and evil alike, treating good and evil, just and unjust, as His children. It is fatherlike thus to act. Many earthly fathers, certainly the best of them, so deal with their children. They give good gifts to all their children, not merely to the more exemplary with whom they are well pleased. No father deals with his children on the principle of strict justice. Every good father does more for all his children than they can claim, much more than unworthy children deserve. It is therefore only in accordance with analogy that the Father in heaven should so act. That He does so act is familiar to us all. We can all testify, “He hath not dealt with us after our sins.”¹ The least worthy have the

¹ *Ps. ciii. 10.*

best reason to know this. How much good they have received; how little they have deserved!

Thus far as to the general import of this second saying containing the name "Father." A little analysis may help us to a clearer view of its full significance. It contains, we observe, a statement of fact and a certain construction put on the fact.

The fact stated is that to a large extent good comes to all irrespective of character. Sun and shower represent that common good. How much they cover! From sunshine and rain duly mixed come good crops, food for man and beast in abundance. That means general well-being, all that one could wish for a community in the way of material prosperity.

That the fact is as Jesus stated it, is to us self-evident. But it was by no means a matter of course that a Jewish teacher should have seen the fact so clearly, and stated it so broadly. The tendency of the Hebrew mind was to think differently, and to regard God solely as a moral Governor rendering to every man according to his works. For men holding this view there was a strong temptation to force facts to square with the theory. Strictly carried out, that would mean the sun shining only on the good, the rain falling only on the just; or the evil and the unjust getting more sunshine and rain than is meet, bringing dearths and deluges to punish them for their sins. "Who," asked Eliphaz boldly, "who ever perished being innocent, or when were the righteous cut off? Even as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same."¹ That was the old theory in its baldest form. The hero of the poem is represented as doubting its truth. "Very natural, very desirable perhaps," replied he in effect; "but unhappily the facts do not bear your theory out." Jesus is on the side of Job. He breaks with the traditional theory,

¹ Job iv. 7, 8.

and He does so because He has discarded the traditional legal conception of God as a mere Governor dealing with men according to strict justice. His mind was not dominated by current opinions or theories, however venerable, and among the notions He repudiated was this one that good or ill in lot is a sure index of good or ill in character. He saw and said that this view was contradicted by two classes of facts: by tribulation endured by good men for righteousness sake, and by temporal prosperity enjoyed by many unworthy men not less, often even more, than by the worthy. The statement in the text about the sun and the rain is therefore not to be taken as a mere truism which any one might have spoken. It is rather the original utterance of one endowed with an unbiassed mind, a clear vision and an unfettered tongue, who saw things as they were, and fearlessly said what He saw.

Note next the construction put upon the fact, which is even more characteristic. The fact being that to a large extent all things come alike to all, the question naturally obtrudes itself: What is the meaning of it? Some might say: that there is no real Providence, that all things happen by general law acting without design or consciousness, that the natural order of the universe is perfectly indifferent to moral interests. It certainly seems so, insomuch that no man who holds this view can easily be argued out of it by an appeal to facts, though there are facts of human history patent to a wide observation which go to show that there is indeed a Power other than ourselves in the world making for righteousness. But besides this agnostic construction there is another which may be put on the facts, one harmonising with a firm faith in a living God and in an intelligent Providence. We may see in the universal boons of sun and shower the *magnanimity* of a Father treating all His children to a certain extent alike.

Such was Christ's reading of the facts. As to the facts

themselves He is at one with the unbeliever. The difference is wholly one of interpretation. But how wide the difference there! In the same facts the agnostic finds no God, and no Providence, while Jesus finds a *gracious* God and a benignant, magnanimous Providence. Extremes meet. No God, or the highest kind of God, a Father; no Providence, or a Providence good to all.

These two sayings of Jesus combined give a balanced view of the Divine Fatherhood. Each is complementary of the other. The one teaches that God hath a special paternal delight in the morally faithful, the other that He exercises a benignant Providence over all, doing good even to the morally unfaithful, His wayward and disobedient children. The former implies decided moral preference, the latter a sphere of action within which moral distinctions are overlooked. Either without the other is liable to run into excess. Moral preference tends to exclusiveness, universal benevolence to indifferentism. Combine the two, and both defects are eliminated. Not only so, the two contrasted qualities interpenetrate and aid each other. God's moral preferences lend emphasis to His magnanimity, making it appear a thing of grace, and not a thing of course. On the other hand the Divine magnanimity, viewed as unmerited favour, is seen to signify a desire that the unworthy may become true sons of God, objects of His complacent regard; an invitation to those who are in the outer circle of sonship to press into the inner circle.

Most of the other texts in the sermon containing the title "Father" bear on two topics: simplicity in religion, and freedom from care on the part of those who have made the Kingdom their chief end. They occur in the sixth chapter of Matthew. Spurious religion appears invested with two evil qualities: ostentation, the vice of Pharisaism; and superstition, the vice of heathenism. The religion of the Pharisee, as manifested in almsgiving, praying and

fasting, is in relation to men a display, in relation to God a form. The religion of the pagan has for its root unbelief in the good will of the gods,—fear. Therefore, when he prays, he indulges in vain repetition, thinking that he shall be heard for his much speaking, by his *battology* compelling his god to lend a reluctant ear. The cure for both vices is a filial conception of God as Father. So Jesus hints to His disciples by the frequent introduction of the Paternal title in this part of His discourse. And on reflection we perceive the truth of the doctrine. The relation of father and son, *like all intimate relations*, demands, in the first place, sincere, real affection. Every true son cares more for the esteem of his father than for that of the outside world. In the sphere of religion this means that a true thought of God as Father gives the death-blow to religious ostentation. The filial worshipper does not care about appearing devout to men; he seeks above all the approval of his heavenly Father. Then it will be impossible for him to mock his Father by a formal routine service in which there is no heart. He will offer always a worship in which thought and feeling find utterance: an *eloquent* worship because therein *all that is within him speaks*.

Faith in the Divine Father is the cure for everything savouring of pagan superstition in religion, not less than for Pharisaic ostentation and formalism. Who can indulge in vain repetition in prayer who believes in a Father's willing ear? More generally what place for elaborate ritual of any sort in a religion which has for its object of worship a Father? Simplicity is congenial to the filial spirit; and by using the name Father in connection with the inculcation of simplicity in prayer Jesus would have His disciples understand that God loves such simplicity. Such love pertains to the paternal relation. There is a place for ceremonial in the public functions of a king, but in the bosom of his own family the most august monarch gladly makes

his escape from pomp and state. In this connection we perceive the significance of another Father-logion not contained in the Sermon on the Mount, but kindred in spirit to those now under consideration. "Every plant which My heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."¹ The particular plant referred to was the tradition of the elders respecting ceremonial ablutions. The implied doctrine is that a Father-God could have no hand in planting such an institution. His characteristic function rather is to eradicate everything of the kind which strikes its roots into the soil of man's religious nature. And the effectual uprooter is just the new way of thinking concerning God as Father. That was one of Christ's reasons for giving the new name so prominent a place in His religious vocabulary. He believed that just in proportion as His disciples got accustomed to a filial mode of conceiving God would Rabbinical and even Levitical ritual lose its hold on their minds, and leave them free to worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Would that the Church in all ages had been more abundantly baptized into the new Divine name! Then the portent of Sacramentarianism, with all that goes along with it, had never made its appearance in Christendom. For that also is a plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted.

"Care not; your Father cares for you," said Jesus in effect to His disciples in that part of His discourse which is directed against earthly anxieties.² It is assumed that those who are thus admonished are making the Kingdom of God their chief end, and the aim is to set them free from distraction arising out of concern about food and raiment. The appositeness of the title "Father" applied to God in this connection is obvious. It is a father's part to provide for his children. By calling God Father, in an exhortation

¹ *Matthew* xv. 13.

² *Matthew* vi. 25-34.

against care, Jesus in effect teaches that God's Fatherliness includes Providence among its attributes and functions. And if disciples but thoroughly believed this, it would certainly transport them into that care-free region of feeling in which their Master desired them to dwell. He lived habitually up there Himself, without effort, because He had an undoubting faith in a Paternal Providence which with un-sleeping solicitude looked after the interests of those who, with singleness of heart, gave themselves to the service of the Kingdom. How perfect was the peace that through this faith reigned in His bosom this very admonition against care suffices to show. What divine serenity it breathes! And what simple delight in the world of nature finds expression in it! The careworn are so moody and gloomy that they have no eye for the wildflowers, and no ear for the song of birds, or for the music of rippling brooks or autumn winds. But Jesus had an eye and an ear for all sights and sounds of nature. "I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." Enquire not curiously of what flower He spoke, as if it must needs have been some exceptionally lovely flower of gorgeous hue that called forth such an encomium. Jesus, I believe, would have said the same thing about the simplest wildflower that grows in the meadow or by the wayside: the snowdrop, the primrose, or the daisy.

The peace Jesus Himself enjoyed He desired His disciples to attain, and for that end He plied them with arguments fitted to aid weak faith. Noteworthy are two drawn from human experience, and put in the form of questions: "Is not the life more than meat?" and "Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?" Both questions suggest an argument from what God has done to what He may be expected to do. What He has done is in both instances the greater thing, what He has yet to do the less. God has given to all *life* a greater thing than the

means of life, food and raiment. The argument is: if God has already bestowed on us the greater boon, why doubt as to His continuing to give us the less—the means of sustaining that life He has conferred on all as an unsought blessing? The point of the second question is not so obvious. It seems to hint at a form of anxiety which no human being ever was absurd enough to cherish. Who ever thought of adding to his stature one cubit? Pressed by the surface difficulty, many recent commentators have adopted the view that the question refers not to increase of bodily stature, but to lengthening of life. The use of measures of length in space as symbols of length in time is not unexampled in Scripture. We have an instance of it in *Psalm xxxix. 5*, where, speaking of the brevity of life, the Psalmist says: “Behold Thou hast made my days as an handbreadth.” It is therefore quite conceivable that our Lord asked anxious-minded persons: “Which of you by any amount of care can add to his days a period of time corresponding in length to a cubit?” It would have been a very pertinent question, for the tendency of care is not to lengthen our days, but rather to shorten them. Yet I am persuaded that this was not the thought Jesus meant to convey. His question refers to stature, and its aim is to remind the anxious that God has done for every man arrived at maturity what no man by any amount of thinking or wishing can do for himself. Every grown man is more than a cubit taller than he was as a child. The addition to his stature is the effect of a gradual growth going on insensibly for years. How unobtrusively the marvellous result was achieved, the process incessantly going on, but from day to day unobservable, perceptible only after the lapse of large intervals of time. The boy measures himself against the wall to-day, and this time next year he will repeat the process and find to his delight that he has grown one or two inches. But he had no hand in producing that

growth save by taking the food provided for him by his parents and indulging with boyish glee in the sports which promote growth, but have not growth for their conscious aim. The cubit is added in the care-free time of life. The boy sports and grows and reaches manhood with one cubit or two, or even three added to his stature, not by him, but by the laws of nature, or, as Christ would have said, by the kindness of His heavenly Father. And Christ's argument is: "If God has done that greater thing for you, rearing you from infancy to the stature of manhood, providing all the time the food necessary for growth, why doubt His readiness and power to find for you the needful sustenance now? You did well, by God's help, when you were boys and girls undistracted by care. Why not carry a little of the spirit of boyhood into your mature life, and, if possible, remain young-hearted all your days?"

We have now learned these four things regarding the Divine Fatherhood as defined by discriminating use in the hill teaching of our Lord: It implies delight in the noble conduct of heroic men; magnanimous treatment of the unworthy; intimate relations between God and men, demanding from the latter sincere, simple-hearted religious affections; and effective provision for the temporal wants of all who devote themselves to the higher concerns of life. This is much, but it is not all. We miss a cheering word about the pardon of sin and aid in the fight with evil. The magnanimity ascribed to the Divine Father might indeed be held to cover these needs, and it does inferentially; yet the express reference of that attribute as spoken of in the Sermon is to the sunshine and the showers. Inference in connection with such vital matters is not enough; we need positive assurance. And we have it in two petitions of the *Pater Noster*: "Forgive us our debts"; "Deliver us from evil." By putting these petitions into the mouths of disciples in a prayer addressed to the Father in Heaven, Jesus

gave them to understand that pardon of their moral shortcomings and power to live well were boons to be confidently expected from one standing to them in the relation of Father. The doctrine at this point also is congruous to the nature of fatherhood. Every true father forgives his children not once, but many times. He deals not with them after their sins. He also gives them all the aid he can to do what is right; by prayer, wise counsel and good example striving to keep their feet from evil ways. If God be indeed a Father, He may be expected to do likewise: not coming behind good earthly fathers, rather doing more for His erring children than an earthly parent has either the will or the power to do. A father on earth must sometimes stop short at mere desire. He cannot give his child a good spirit, or a holy bias, or write the law of duty on his heart. But the Divine Father is both able and willing. Often earthly fathers are lacking even in respect of good will. How many of them readily conclude that the waywardness of a disobedient son has exceeded the limits of the forgivable, and harden their hearts against him? He is a rare father, of phenomenally tender heart, who can fitly represent in his parental conduct the mercy of God. Jesus has drawn his picture in the parable of the Prodigal Son. Why does that picture affect us so powerfully? Because it tells us fathers what we ought to be, but are not. It is a poetic ideal far transcending the reality of ordinary family life. Jesus drew that pathetic picture that we might know that what for many of us is merely ideal is real for God. "God," He would teach, "behaves so towards His returning prodigal children. Judge Him not by yourselves. His ways are not your ways." In that beautiful parable the doctrine of Jesus concerning the Fatherhood of God in the moral sphere reached its climax. It is the best concrete commentary on the abstract general petition: "Forgive us our debts." Who without such a pictorial representation

of Divine forgiveness would have the courage to think that even God could pardon in that magnificent way?

And yet there is greater magnificence behind all that. Nothing more generous and handsome can be conceived than the reception given by the father to the prodigal on his arrival. But what if he had gone in quest of the wanderer as the shepherd went in quest of the straying sheep, enduring the hardships of the long way and the miseries of the famine-stricken land, and, finding the lost one there, had claimed him as his son, and by moving entreaties induced him to return home? That would have been a deeper depth of pity, and a pardon costing the pardoner more. It is no fault of the parable that it leaves this phase of fatherly love out of the picture. Room had to be made for the free play of *penitence*, the lost one in this case being not a sheep, but a *man*. For in the human sphere finding means self-finding, coming to oneself in contrite reflection. But the seeking and the suffering connected therewith have their place here also. The Son of man came to seek the lost. In Him, if He be Divine, the Father came to seek the lost. Patripassianism is not wholly a heresy.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE MYSTICAL ELEMENT IN ST. PAUL'S THEOLOGY.

THE theology of St. Paul was the product of three factors—(1) his early Pharisaic training, perhaps the only course of systematic study for which he ever found time; (2) his contact with other minds in mission work, in which he made it his principle to take the intellectual and religious standpoint of those whom he wished to convince (Rom. i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 20), and which therefore often determined the form in which his teaching was presented; and (3)

his own spiritual experiences, the real foundation of his belief, which springs always living from his heart.

The interaction of the first and second of these factors—the Rabbinical and the (predominantly) Hellenic elements in his theology, has been very fully discussed from various points of view by many writers. Nor can it be said that the study of his inner religious life, as manifested in his writings, has been neglected. But I am not acquainted with any treatise on Paulinism, nor any commentary on St. Paul's epistles, which gives as prominent place as I could wish to the distinctive notes or characteristics of mystical religion which, as it seems to me, form the presuppositions on which his system of Christian theology is based. The mystical type of religion is a very well marked and unchanging type. It is by no means peculiar to Christianity, though its brightest examples, like those of other types, belong to the Church; but has shown itself able to spring and bloom luxuriantly in the most various soils, as the Neoplatonists, the Sufis, the Spanish and the German mystics testify. Its chief characteristics may, I think, be enumerated as follows:—

(1) The belief that there is a suprarational faculty, which makes us receptive of direct illumination from the world of spirits. The soul's powers of spiritual discernment, and of communion with the unseen, increase in proportion as she progresses on the upward path, till they culminate in the beatific vision, the contemplation of God Himself. This vision is sometimes, as by Plotinus, regarded as the crown of earthly existence, hardly to be won by years of yearning and detachment from the world; sometimes it is a frequent phenomenon of the religious life (Iamblichus, St. Theresa), or visions are even the mode in which the call to lead the higher life is communicated (Jacob Böhme; and cf. *Tertull. de animo*, 47: "maior paene vis hominum e visionibus Deum discunt"). The first of

these notions about the vision has been most common in the Roman Catholic Church, where it is at once the badge and the reward of the highest sanctity; the last among the Protestant mystics, who have regarded themselves as chosen instruments to communicate the truth. The passage quoted from Tertullian, and others referred to by Harnack (*History of Dogma*, English ed., vol. i. p. 53), show how familiar these experiences were to the early Christians.

(2) The disposition to conceive of eternity not only or chiefly as a "future state," but as a truer and higher reality than the world of time and space; as the completed thought of God, which has to realize itself in the cosmic process; or, as the substance of which the phenomenal world is the blurred reflection. From the notion of the intelligible world as the only true reality, it follows that the empirical ego is an illusion, and that man can only "come to himself" by transcending it. With religious minds of this class, the idea of God as a task-master, assigning wages and punishments, falls into the background, or is even repudiated in favour of an exalted idealism, which finds beatitude ("life") in union with God, and perdition ("death") in entanglement with the perishable *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. The destiny of the wicked is variously conceived, as *paena damni*, as annihilation, or by some theory of transmigration.

(3) Mortification of the flesh as a means to the higher life. There are two kinds of asceticism:—one, the self-discipline and training of the spiritual athlete, which has as its object an increase of outward efficiency; the other, the asceticism of *mortification*, that is to say, the starving and crushing out of elements in our personality which are believed to impede our spiritual growth. The object here is primarily to clarify the intuitive faculties of the soul. The latter form is generally associated with that dualistic

theory of the universe, which believes matter to be the seat of the evil principle, and is apt to assume its harshest form where this dualism is most pronounced.

(4) Conscious freedom from the fetters of legal and institutional religion. This inner emancipation has sometimes led the mystic to revolt against the ecclesiastical order, but more often, since institutions are regarded as indifferent rather than as mischievous or sinful, and since, moreover, even the mystic needs forms in which to clothe his feelings, it has led him back into complete submission to authority. The sacramental system of course stands with him on a different footing from other rules and ordinances.

These four seem to be the normal characteristics of religious mysticism. Its morbid forms or *παρεκβάσεις* are numerous.

(1) Its asceticism has frequently degenerated into self-torture, generally with the object of quenching the smouldering embers of sensuality (see lives of hermits and saints, *passim*), but sometimes in a kind of passion of self-immolation (*e.g.* St. John of the Cross).

(2) The doctrine of self-simplification, the *via negativa*, is prominent in the Neoplatonists, in "Dionysius," and indeed in the majority of mystical writings, including even the *Theologia Germanica*. This is connected with a false dualism which is really a defect of spirituality, inasmuch as it endeavours to cast out the *κόσμος αἰσθητὸς* and ultimately even the *κόσμος νοητὸς*, instead of seeing in them manifestations of the One. Common as this error is in the history of mysticism, it can only be regarded as a divergence from its true principles; for to attempt to "become God," who is the *πλήρωμα* of all attributes, by a process of *κένωσις*, is to confound zero with infinity. The theory is carried to its logical conclusion by the Indian devotees. "The Yogi is free from hope and free from

perception. He sits with his mind bent upon one object, his eyes fixed on the point of his nose."

(3) The *via negativa* is the inner side of that which appears in external life as retirement from the world, quietism, or apathy. This is often found (as in India) in connection with the Pantheistic error, on the verge of which mystics often tremble so soon as, or even before, they have abjured dualism. The temptation to withdraw from the world, and not try to influence it, is very strong in dreamy and sensitive natures, especially when reinforced by fatalism, and a weakened consciousness of personality. It has stricken with barrenness many lives of high promise (cf. Amiel's *Journal Intime*).

(4) The belief in a special enlightenment to be gained by discipline has led to (a) intellectual or spiritual arrogance (some of the Gnostics and Neoplatonists); (b) claims not only of special insight, but of special powers; hence, theurgy and magic (the later Neoplatonists; Paracelsus; modern Theosophists). The latter belief has often been aided by the hypothesis of intermediate beings (demons, spirits) between God and humanity.

(5) Contempt for, or denial of objectivity to, the world of phenomena has led to practical antinomianism, and in particular to licentiousness—*παραχρησθαι τῇ σαρκί* (Carpocratian Gnostics; Anabaptists; some sects in America).

If we study St. Paul's Epistles with these thoughts in our minds, we shall find that his conception of Christianity exhibits all the features of true mysticism, while his inspired prescience sees and guards against almost all of its morbid developments.

(1) The belief in a suprarational illumination is most unequivocally professed by St. Paul, who places it as the foundation on which his own Christianity rests (1 Cor. ii. 1-16; Gal. i. 12 *al.*). The significance of his frequent disparagement of human reason (1 Cor. i.) and human

evidence (Gal. i. 11-24) cannot be missed. That such illumination is normally granted only to the *πνευματικοί* or *τέλειοι*, and that this condition depends on self-discipline, is plainly taught in many passages. Again, the metaphor from mirrors (1 Cor. xiii; 2 Cor. iii. 18) is very characteristic of mysticism, as are other expressions in which revelation or grace is spoken of as light shining down upon us. Even the famous *ὄψις* of Plotinus has its counterpart in the Apostle's own experience (2 Cor. xii. 1-4), a passage which, I think, has not been given its due weight as throwing light upon the psychology of St. Paul.

(2) The negation of the lower empirical self, the real kernel of mysticism, which finds the cardinal point of Christian truth in the text, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it," is also the foundation of St. Paul's psychology. Modern theology, which is nervously afraid of depersonalizing man, is too much inclined to attenuate the significance of such texts as Rom. vi. 6-11; 2 Cor. iv. 10-12; Gal. ii. 20, in which a mystical death must precede the mystical union with Christ, and in which the passion and resurrection of Christ are to be re-enacted in every individual soul. St. Paul does not even shrink from applying his principle to the knowledge of Christ as a man among men, as a thing to be transcended (2 Cor. v. 16). The only legitimate explanation of these passages is surely that which Tauler made an important part of his system: that in the higher stages of holiness man is conscious of an inward transit from his actual to his ideal self as he lives in the thought of the creating Word. Man is essentially *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. xi. 7), and the same expression is applied to Christ (Col. i. 15-17). We seem very near to Plato here, as also in Col. iii. 10, "the new man is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." It is true that the most definite Platonism is found in Colossians, the

genuineness of which has been much impugned on that very ground ; but these suspicions seem to be unnecessary, if we remember that St. Paul's forced inactivity at Rome would be sure to lead a man of his temperament to develop his already existing tendency to mystical thought, and also that " the fresh dangers threatening the truth from the side of mystic speculation required to be confronted by an exposition of the Gospel from a corresponding point of view." (Lightfoot on Col. i. 9.)

(3) The two views of asceticism are both found, inextricably blended, in St. Paul. The prevailing opinion, that the " dualistic " form of asceticism is not countenanced by him, cannot be maintained in the face of his teaching on the material *σάρξ* as (*de facto*) the principle of sin (see Pfeiderer, *Paulinism*, vol. i. p. 54), of his unmistakably ascetic view of marriage (1 Cor. vii. 1), and of such metaphors as " crucify," " mortify," " buffet," which do not belong to athletic training, though the last (*ὕπωπιάζω*) is used in connection with it (1 Cor. ix. 27). How he guards against the perversion of this doctrine I shall consider presently. It is easy to understand why system-mongers energetically deny this dualistic element in St. Paul's psychology ; but it should not really give offence. St. Paul's inner experience is his guide ; and (as Professor Bruce lately suggested in one of his interesting essays in the *EXPOSITOR*) the Apostle seems to have had a real struggle with his lower instincts, which may well have led him to regard *σάρξ* as informed by an active maleficent energy. It is also true, I think, that this ethical dualism is always prevalent at times when humanity is engaged in a painful attempt to subdue some importunate appetite, which is visibly threatening to ruin civilization. The instinctive revolt against unbridled sensuality under the Roman empire, a revolt of which the ascetics were the champions, and in a sense the martyrs, is the strongest instance of this kind in history.

(4) The antinomianism of mysticism is also very apparent in St. Paul, though carefully safeguarded against abuse (see below). Romans and Galatians supply many statements which claim for the Christian a complete freedom from every code except the law of love. See, too, 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23; and especially Col. ii. 20-22, where immunity from the obligation to keep ecclesiastical ordinances is based on the transitory and unreal character of the phenomenal world in which such ceremonies are enacted.

St. Paul, then, was in thorough sympathy with that form of religion which we call mysticism, in all its legitimate developments. For this very reason he is best qualified to deal with its various distortions.

(1) False asceticism. St. Paul's psychology is, as I have said, frankly dualistic; he regards *σάρξ* as informed by an active agency hostile to *πνεῦμα* (see esp. Rom. viii. 7), and capable of extending its sway over the whole man. He is apparently more dualistic here than (*e.g.*) Plotinus, just because of his deeper knowledge of human nature and of sin. The premature synthesis of Plotinus leaves the dualism really unsolved; with him the soul cannot be contaminated, and therefore the life in time remains external to the ego. But with St. Paul the flesh is also the organ of a self whose function it is to be governed by the Spirit; and the whole man—"spirit, soul, and body"—is to be redeemed together (1 Thess. v. 23). Thus he leaves the origin of evil unexplained, while insisting on its positive reality, and refuses to sacrifice the unity of human nature in a futile attempt to solve that enigma. So long as flesh is informed by the evil principle it must be not only exercised and trained, but buffeted and mortified; but it is not evil in itself, and therefore is to be rescued from the bondage of corruption, not cast out into nothingness. The statement in Rom. viii. 3 (condemned sin in the flesh) is to be understood to mean that sin is not the *true* principle even of *σάρξ*, that the Incarnation proves that it is not so.

(2) The error of the *via negativa* is disposed of once for all in 2 Cor. v. 1-4: we desire to be "clothed upon," not to be stripped bare. Compare, too, all the passages where the "fulness of God" is promised. But the truest safeguard against this mistake is to be found in the precept "imitate Christ." Our object while on earth must be to copy the ideal human life, not the life of Him who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto.

(3) St. Paul's whole life was eloquent against apathy and quietism; and though we can point to few direct warnings against this tendency, we may say that his whole conception of the Christian society as a living organism, requiring reasonable service from each of its members (1 Cor. ix. 16; Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. *passim*), or as a temple of God to be gradually raised (1 Cor. iii.), absolutely precludes the false notion that any human being has the right to become a mere spectator of the world-process. Thus with him self-renunciation finds its natural outlet in the life of charity, not in the "artificial vacancy" of the Quietist. (Cf. T. H. Green, *Miscell.*, p. 239.)

(4) In Colossians St. Paul seems to go a long way with the Gnostics in admitting a σοφία which is accessible only to the τέλειοι (1 Cor. ii. 6); in regarding advance in the Christian life as ἐπίγνωσις, σοφία, and σύνεσις πνευματικῇ (Col. i. 9); and in speaking of the indwelling Christ as a μυστήριον (i. 27; ii. 2, 3) in whom reside all the esoteric (ἀπόκρυφοι) treasures of σοφία and γνῶσις. But he adopts this language only to repudiate the false γνῶσις and σοφία, which are but κενὴ ἀπάτη (ii. 8). He regards "perfection" as within the reach of all, and denies that it depends on the intellect. So far is this last from the truth that the weak things of the world have been chosen to confound the wise (cf. 1 Cor. i.). The same epistle contains a polemic against that belief in intermediate agencies on which theurgy and magic are based. (St. Paul must not be sup-

posed to commit himself to those speculations about the heavenly hierarchy which are referred to in this epistle.)

(5) The coarser forms of antinomianism are repudiated with decisive energy in Romans; but St. Paul's polemic against Judaism led him to lay great stress on the emancipation from rules and ordinances, which the Christian might justly claim. (1 Cor. vii.; Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10, etc.) The only reason which he admits as adequate for submitting to such observances, is the duty of not offending the weaker brethren (1 Cor. vi. 12; viii. 4-13). That a certain degree of freedom may be claimed even within the limits of the moral code seems to follow from his principles, and may even be inferred from his vigorous denunciations of those who turn liberty into license; hence perhaps the necessity for the rigorous church discipline, which he founded or encouraged, and which was especially concerned with the suppression of immoral practices.

The combination which we find in St. Paul of religious mysticism with extreme activity in the service of God and man is not such a rare phenomenon as is sometimes supposed. The life of General Gordon furnishes a fine example in our own day. Such men have found a practical, if not an intellectual, solution of one of the deepest antinomies of life, and have exhibited in their lives a noble consistency which is itself a testimony that there is no discord between the outward and inward parts of religion, though in theory the seemingly conflicting claims of the two are not always easy to reconcile. Language can hardly get beyond the sublime contradiction of St. Paul's words, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

W. R. INGE.

*THE MEANING OF "RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD"
IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.*

IN the Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, contributed A.D. 1890 to the *Pulpit Commentary*, the present writer propounded and supported a view of the essential meaning of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, as used in the Epistle, differing from the current one adopted by previous commentators. The view was subsequently taken up with some reservation by the Rev. Dr. Robertson, principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall Durham, in a paper contributed by him to *The Thinker* in November, 1893. More recently, Professor Sanday and Mr. Arthur Headlam, in their volume on the Epistle to the Romans for the *International Critical Commentary*, allude to these "two protests, quite recently raised" against what had "seemed for some time past to be almost an accepted exegetical tradition," saying, further, that "there can be little doubt that the protest is justified; not so much that the current view is wrong as that it is partial and incomplete" (p. 24). And in their valuable commentary on the Epistle they show evident signs of being influenced throughout by this recently propounded view. The phrase being a sort of key-note to the doctrine of the Epistle, and a right conception of it being of such importance for understanding duly St. Paul's teaching on justification, a little further consideration of it will not, it is hoped, be out of place at the present stage of thought on the subject.

The view in question was stated generally thus in the *Pulpit Commentary* (Introduction, p. x.). On *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, with especial reference to its first occurrence (Rom. i. 17), it was said, "It is usual to interpret this as meaning man's imputed or *forensic* righteousness, which is from God—*Θεοῦ* being understood as the genitive of origin. . . . The phrase, in itself, suggests rather the sense in

which it is continually used in the Old Testament, as denoting God's own eternal righteousness." Further (p. xi.), "It is maintained in this Commentary (with all due deference to the distinguished ancients and moderns who have held otherwise) that not only in this opening passage, but throughout the Epistle, *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* does mean God's own eternal righteousness, and that, even in passages where a righteousness that is of faith is spoken of as communicated to man, the essential idea beyond is still that of God's own righteousness including believers in itself."

What is proposed in the present article is, (1) To examine the initial passage, i. 17, in which the theme of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* is first announced, as well as the subsequent passage, iii. 21, 22, where, after preparatory argument, the theme is again announced with a view to its exposition. (2) To consider other passages which may seem to conflict with the most obvious interpretation (as we contend) of the expression in the announcement of the theme, in order to see whether they do really imply or suggest a different one. (3) To attempt, with whatever diffidence, a view of the teaching of the great Apostle on the general subject, based on an unprejudiced consideration of the language he employed.

1. St. Paul, after declaring his readiness to preach the Gospel, of which he is not ashamed, at Rome as well as elsewhere, as being the power of God unto salvation to every believer, Greek as well as Jew, thus announces its contents: *δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*. Now, surely in these words taken by themselves, and but for other passages in the Epistle, or perhaps still more for generally received ideas having been read into St. Paul by theologians, *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* could be taken to mean nothing else but God's own righteousness. Before offering proof of this it may be premised that the

translation, *a* righteousness of God, given in the R.V., cannot be right, being evidently due only to a preconceived idea of the meaning of the phrase. A sufficient reason for rejecting it is the occurrence in the next verse, and in close connexion, of the similar phrase ὀργὴ Θεοῦ, also without the article. Here the R.V., with glaring inconsistency, has rightly translated "*the* wrath of God," though still giving the meaningless alternative of "*a* wrath" in the margin. In fact, neither expression requires the article for denoting "God's righteousness," and "God's wrath," both being recognised names of well-known things. Somewhat similarly, Κύριος in the sense of the LORD (cf. *e.g.* Rom. ix. 29) does not require the article; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews υἱός without the article is uniformly used to denote the well-known Son of psalm and prophecy, though to translate it, when it thus occurs, as "*a* son" would obviously be quite misleading. This then being admitted, what is the obvious meaning of "God's righteousness" in the passage before us—introduced, be it observed, before any exposition of the doctrine of the justification of man, which might have suggested a different meaning? Surely that which all the first readers of the Epistle, familiar (as they were evidently supposed to be) with the ideas of the Old Testament, would at once attach to it, viz., God's own eternal righteousness. There can be no need here to quote at large from the Old Testament in order to show how the Hebrew phrase rendered in the LXX. by δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in this sense, and this only, pervades the Psalms and the Prophets. "God's Wrath" is also a constant topic, denoting that reprobation of sin (expressed of necessity under the human ideas of indignation and anger) which is inseparable from our conception of the Divine holiness. But no less prominent is the idea of God's own inherent and eternal righteousness, notwithstanding all the apparent contradictions to it in the world

of His creation. It is to their unshaken conviction of this, assured to them by faith, that the inspired writers continually recur for comfort and support in the midst of present evil. After trouble in view of the transgression of the wicked, the psalmist finds his consolation in the thought, "Thy lovingkindness, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; thy judgments are a great deep. . . . Therefore the children of men take refuge under the shadow of Thy wings" (Ps. xxvi.). And, further, the whole prophetic conception of the Messianic kingdom is based on the idea of the eternal Divine righteousness vindicating itself at last under the King of righteousness to come, and, as it were, taking possession of the world. As, for instance, where Isaiah says, "My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the peoples; the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust. . . . My salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. . . . My righteousness shall be for ever, and my salvation from generation to generation" (Isa. li. 5-8). The fulfilment of all such prophetic anticipations must have been in St. Paul's mind, and must have been suggested to his first readers, when, in the passage before us, he spoke of God's righteousness having been revealed in the gospel, his faith having shown him in Christ the inauguration at last of the Messianic kingdom. Besides, the occurrence of the expression in close connexion of *ὁργὴ Θεοῦ*, which cannot possibly mean anything but God's own wrath, in itself seems to necessitate its being similarly understood. Further, we observe not only the correspondence of St. Paul's language with that of ancient prophecy generally, including (as in the passage from Isaiah above quoted) the connexion of salvation (*σωτηρία*) with the display of the Divine righteousness; we

also note the direct derivation of his words here from one particular Old Testament passage, viz., Psalm xcvi. 2, which in the LXX. is Ἐγνώρισε Κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, ἐναντίον τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπεκάλυψε τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ. Here we have all the ideas of the passage before us—*righteousness, salvation, revelation*, and that to the *Gentiles*—with use of the same Greek words as in the LXX. And there can be no doubt of what “His righteousness” means in the Psalm. But it has been said that ἐκ πίστεως, added by St. Paul, modifies the otherwise apparent sense of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, intimating in this case a righteousness of faith, which is from God, and imputed to man. If it had been ἢ ἐκ πίστεως, there would have been something in the contention; but it is not so: and further, the ἐκ πίστεως which follows ἀποκαλύπτεται is evidently to be taken with it, and not with δικαιοσύνη, forming part of the predicate, and not of the subject of the sentence. It simply denotes how God’s righteousness is revealed to the soul of man. It is faith which apprehends it. Of this the Apostle had a vivid sense from his own experience. The manifestation of Christ in the flesh had been no revelation to him till on the journey to Damascus the flash of faith opened his inward vision, and he recognised the Messiah in Jesus. And so always. The manifestation of God’s righteousness in Christ is not obvious to the unbelieving world: it is of faith that the revelation comes. And not only ἐκ πίστεως, but also εἰς πίστιν. The spark of faith first opens the revelation, but the result is to be a habit of faith, as the principle of our lives.

It has, however, been further argued that the quotation from Habakkuk, in which the word δίκαιος occurs with reference to man, at any rate suggests the idea of a righteousness of man himself being intended. By no means. The quotation is introduced in connexion with ἐκ πίστεως, in support of the position that the revelation—

not the righteousness—is of faith. It was so in the case of the ancient prophet. He lived at a troublous time, waiting for God's vindication of His own everlasting righteousness (cf. ii. 12, 13): "and so he stood upon his watch-tower, watching to see what the Lord would say unto him." And it was revealed to him that "the vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not tarry." Meanwhile faith revealed it to him, with an assurance that by faith the righteous should live. It is to be particularly observed that in Habakkuk ἐκ πίστεως is not connected with ὁ δίκαιος, but with ζήσεται: it is not "the just one by faith shall live," but "by faith the just one shall live." And if it be said that, notwithstanding this, the very occurrence of the word δίκαιος, after the previous δικαιοσύνη, suggests the idea of a righteousness of man himself being in St. Paul's view, it may be enough to reply that Habakkuk certainly used the equivalent Hebrew word in its ordinary Old Testament sense, when applied to men, of *upright*; and hence that its occurrence in the quotation from him proves nothing to the point. Microscopic examination of single words that happen to be used in sentences may be carried so far as to draw attention from their obvious general meaning.

Let us pass now to the renewed announcement of the theme in iii. 21, which should evidently be read in connexion with the initial one, each, if there is any difficulty in either, throwing light upon the other. The reason why this second announcement has been so long deferred was the need of proving first the revelation of the *wrath* of God including all, evidenced by the present condition of mankind and by the human conscience, and thus showing the futility of the Jewish plea of δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου, that is, of man's own righteousness availing for justification on the

ground of his actual obedience to Divine law. The ground being thus prepared, the Apostle announces once more, and now proceeds to set forth, the only possible remedy for the existing state of things, namely, the revelation of the righteousness of God. The intervening argument suggests, indeed, additional phrases in the new announcement, but the essential meaning of the announcement is unchanged. It is as follows: *Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας, οὐ γὰρ ἔστι διαστολή.* To avoid possible misunderstanding it should be observed in the first place that the introduction of the expression *χωρὶς νόμου* by no means affects the meaning, whatever it may be, of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*. It only asserts, with reference to the preceding argument, that the revelation now made is on a principle quite different and separate from that relied on by the Jew; it is *apart from* (*χωρὶς*) any theory of *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου*. Further, the interposed *μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν* comes in, after St. Paul's manner, in anticipation of what, having the thought already in his mind, he is about to prove. For in the argument that follows he is at pains to show that the principle he maintains, though *χωρὶς νόμου*, is not in contradiction to the "law and prophets," but really anticipated and supported by them. We may therefore, for getting at the essential drift of this renewed announcement, omit these parenthetical clauses, and render thus: "But now God's righteousness has been manifested—yea, *God's* righteousness—through faith in Jesus Christ unto and upon all that believe, for there is no distinction" (*i.e.* between Jew and Gentile). Thus this new announcement of the main theme is found to correspond exactly with the other, the only difference being that here we have *πεφανέρωται* instead of *ἀποκαλύπτεται*, and the more inclusive *διὰ πίστεως* instead of *ἐκ πίστεως εἰς*

πίστιν, while the addition of εἰς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας etc., has its counterpart in the παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι etc., which preceded i. 17. There is obviously no justification for the introduction, as in A.V., of *which is* before διὰ πίστεως, this phrase being connected with πεφανέρωται, as was ἐκ πίστεως in the former passage with ἀποκαλύπτεται. Whatever sense, then, i. 17 had, the same has iii. 21, 22. There is nothing in the latter to change or modify the first apparent meaning of "the righteousness of God."

2. But it may be said that the case is different in subsequent passages, where man's participation in the Divine righteousness comes to be spoken of. No doubt new ideas and modes of expression of necessity come in; but not one, we maintain, in which the primary phrase, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, is ever used in any new sense, or in which the idea of it in the same sense is not virtually present. Let us analyse first, sufficiently for our present purpose, the somewhat difficult but important passage which comes after the second announcement of iii. 21, 22,—Πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ—(This is introduced in support of the previous εἰς πάντας, and οὐ γὰρ ἐστι διαστολή: yes, it is for all, without distinction, Jew as well as Gentile, for all equally require it; the plea of δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου has been shown to fail alike for all)—δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι—(Here δικαιούμενοι, though connected grammatically with πάντες γὰρ ἡμαρτον, seems to be rather connected logically with the previous πάντες τοὺς πιστεύοντας, the intervening clause having been virtually parenthetical. Understanding it thus presents no great difficulty to one familiar with St. Paul's style)—διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. Here we must pause awhile, before proceeding with the passage, to consider the new expressions that have now been used in course of setting forth the application to man, "unto sal-

vation," of the righteousness of God. First, we have δικαιούμενοι. Now there can be no doubt that the verb δικαίω means, not to *make* actually righteous, but to *count* righteous, or to *accept* as righteous—to *acquit*, to *justify*. And here believers are declared to be so accepted "freely"; not on their own merits as having fulfilled the law, but of God's free grace. But this conception does not introduce any different view of the meaning of God's righteousness, or involve its being at all lost sight of. The idea seems rather to be that, they being powerless to rise to *His* righteousness, it comes down to them, because they believe in it, love it, and aspire to it; that it embraces them, as it were, and takes them into itself. But still this could not be but for the "redemption"—the "propitiation"—of Christ. These two words also now come in, ἀπολυτρώσις and ἱλαστήριον, the latter with the addition (which must be joined to it, and not to πίστεως) of ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. It is not necessary to show here (what is certain) that ἀπολυτρώσις in this passage, as elsewhere, means, not *deliverance* only, but *redemption* as usually understood, or that ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι denotes Christ as having actually effected, by the offering of Himself, all that had been signified in the way of propitiation by the bloody sacrifices of the ancient law. There can be no doubt that St. Paul viewed this as having been, in the first place, necessary, in order for men, through faith, to be taken up (as it were) into the righteousness of God, or that he regarded the manifestation of that righteousness in the gospel as including a revelation of the atoning sacrifice. His doctrine distinctly is that the sacrificial rites of old were not meaningless, but expressed a real human need, and that in Christ's offering of Himself (however incompetent we may be to explain how it availed in the supramundane sphere) we are to perceive the full satisfaction of that need, and thereby the old barrier removed against the manifesta-

tion at last of God's eternal righteousness for the salvation of man. Well, but so far we have still found no variation from the first meaning of God's righteousness, but rather (if our interpretation has been right) confirmation of it. In the remainder of the passage now before us we shall find it still more confirmed. The Apostle, in continuation, thus expresses the *purpose* of God in preordaining (or setting forth to view—the meaning of *προέθετο* is uncertain) the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ;—*εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ*. Observe here first that "His righteousness," in no possible sense but that of God's own, twice comes in as the dominant idea. It was for the showing of *that* in two ways, one leading to the other, that the propitiation of the Redeemer was set forth or preordained. It was first "unto (or with a view to) a showing of His (*i.e.* God's) righteousness on account of the passing over, in God's forbearance, of the sins done aforetime." The allowed wickedness of the world had in former times been a difficulty in the way of faith in God's eternal righteousness, in that He passed it over, and forebore from visiting it. But the sacrifice of Christ, the effect of which was retrospective as well as future, has shown that He was not indifferent to sin—that He had all along been Himself righteous; and this showing was for the further showing (it may be best to take *πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν* in the second clause as denoting the sequel of the first *ἔνδειξιν*, while the *τὴν*, now prefixed according to the far best supported readings, points to *the* showing which has been already in view) "of His righteousness at the present time," *i.e.*, in that He could now justify (or accept as righteous) him that is of faith in Jesus. In the concluding clause of the sentence the word *δίκαιον* may be taken to have especial (though not

exclusive) reference to the *πάρεσις* in past time, and *δικαιοῦντα* to the justification of the present time, the expressions in the two parts of the sentence being intended to correspond with each other. Here again, then, *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* emphatically retains its former meaning, nor is there anything to suggest another.

In subsequent passages, where the main subject is the office of faith for appropriating to ourselves the benefit of the revelation of God's righteousness, it cannot be denied that the word *δικαιοσύνη* is used in a secondary sense to express, not absolute righteousness such as God's, but the state of acceptance or acquittal into which, through his faith, the believer enters. But we contend that it never has this sense when, without a preposition intervening, it is followed by *Θεοῦ*; and also that God's own righteousness is never lost sight of as the source from which such acceptance or acquittal flows. The Apostle must have some word to express the believer's condition before God, which is the same, with regard to acceptance, as if he had been himself righteous; and he still appropriately uses the word *δικαιοσύνη*, though in a secondary sense. And there might be, further, this special reason for his doing so. The Jew, against whose theory he all along contends, claimed the possibility of attaining himself to a state of acceptance before God, which he called a state of righteousness; and this correctly from his own point of view, since he conceived of it as actual human righteousness. The Apostle virtually replied: We, too, claim to be able to attain to a state of acceptance before God, which may be called a state of righteousness; but it is on an entirely different principle from yours, *our* righteousness not being our own, but a free gift, flowing to us from the righteousness of God.

Such considerations may suffice for showing why, and in what sense, St. Paul goes on to speak of a righteousness of faith, as imparted to man. His language, when he does so,

will not (we still maintain and we assert again) be found to interfere with the one only sense of the phrase itself, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, wherever it occurs, or with its being, though not expressed, a dominant idea, lying behind the whole argument.

The subsequent passages to which the test may be applied include the following: (1) Chap. iv., in which Abraham's justification by faith and not by works is treated, with such constant expressions as Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην—ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην—σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς, σφραγίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. (2) ver. 17: οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες; and, in the same chapter, εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, and ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. (3) ix. 30: ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην κατέλαβε δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως, Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἔφθασε. Διατί; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. (4) x. 6: Ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει, and (v. 10) καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην. To these may be added, so as to complete the Pauline list, Phil. iii. 9: καὶ εὐρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. We observe in the passage last quoted, in which δικαιοσύνη is used in its secondary sense, that ἐκ is carefully interposed before Θεοῦ.

3. A few remarks may be offered in conclusion as to the general purport of the great Apostle's view and teaching on the mysterious subject treated in his Epistle to the Romans.

He had, we may suppose, as all deep thinkers must have, a deep sense of the old mystery of sin and its apparent inconsistency with the idea of One Righteous and Omnipotent

Creator. His belief in God was too deeply rooted to be for a moment shaken. It is always an axiom with him that God is, and that He is Almighty, Omniscient, above all, and righteous eternally. The origin of evil in His creation at all is a mystery he does not attempt to fathom, only accepting the picture in Genesis of its introduction into the world of man. The subject in its depth is to him among the deep things of God, whose counsels are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out; and the thought of it, as said above, had not at all disturbed his conviction that God Himself is righteous. But he has had deep in his mind a feeling also that the present state of things could only be a temporary subjection of the creature to vanity, for some wise purpose allowed, and that God's righteousness must triumph in the end over sin and evil. His very sense that God Himself was righteous inspired this "earnest expectation"—this undying hope; and the prophetic anticipations, in which he was deeply versed, of the Messianic kingdom had confirmed it. And so, when the sudden flash of faith revealed to him Jesus as the Redeemer who was to come, he perceived with joy the realization of all his long-cherished hopes. God's eternal righteousness was at length manifested in the Christ, for the present salvation of believers of every race, and for the "restitution of all things" in the end. That he looked forward in distant visions to the "restitution of all things" (to use St. Peter's expression) at the final consummation of the manifestation of the Christ, is apparent from many passages in his epistles, though in none of those which we have had under review has there been occasion to express the thought. Cf., *e.g.*, Rom. v. 18, *seq.*; xi. 26, *seq.*; 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Eph. i. 9, 10, 22, 23; Col. i. 15-21. He does not, any more than we can in any definite way, reconcile this grand hope with the idea of the *κόλασις αἰώνιος* due to unrepentant sinners in the eternal sphere which is beyond us now: but it is

important to observe that he does in some way entertain a view, not only of the triumph of the gospel throughout the world at last, but also of the eventual reconciliation of *all things* to God in Christ. And, indeed, it would otherwise be difficult to conceive of the Divine righteousness being fully vindicated. But what more immediately concerns us now is his conception of how faith in Christ avails ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ for salvation. First, we may say, he sees in Him a true *atonement* for human sin. His unwavering belief that the Mosaic law had been from God, as well as his own internal consciousness, had impressed upon him the necessity of some atonement. There must be some true counterpart of those divinely appointed sacrifices; there must be some satisfaction at last of the felt needs of the human soul. He had long felt it impossible that the blood of goats and calves could of themselves avail for the purpose in the spiritual sphere of things. But there was to him no such difficulty with regard to the sacrifice of Christ. Though he often alludes to His blood-shedding as answering to that of the ancient sacrifices, it is not the mere physical blood-shedding, or indeed the mere physical sufferings of the Saviour, that to his mind constitute the essence of the atonement. It was rather that the holy and sinless One, in our nature and representing us, had of His own will offered Himself through the eternal Spirit without spot to God, and had so become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. And then, after the death, had come the resurrection from the dead, as the crowning and convincing evidence of the reality of this great Atonement. He could not, indeed, any more than we, explain in definite human language (as some theologians since his time have unhappily attempted to do) *how* such sacrifice avails on high for pardon. Enough for him that it answered to his ideal of what a true atonement, of which he felt the need, should be; and he rested on it in full faith as fulfilling all the meaning of the ancient sacrifices, and satisfying for ever all human needs.

This, then, in the first place, was a manifestation to him of the righteousness of God for salvation, in that, though He had allowed sin, He had provided an atonement for it, and had not left His creatures without remedy or hope. He did not condemn man eternally for what man could no longer help. And thus too he was at once relieved from the long misery of his ineffectual strivings to attain by his own righteousness to the righteousness of God. He had been trained to think that this was possible. But the more he had striven the more he had felt in his heart that the attempt was vain. While he would do good, he had found, by painful experience, that evil was present with him. But now, his old view having been found impossible, a new view was opened to him, full of hope. Though unable himself to rise to the Divine righteousness, he felt that the Divine righteousness had come down to him, taking him into itself in the Redeemer, so that now faith and loyalty and earnest endeavour could be accepted for perfect performance. The sense of this must indeed have been to his individual soul a revelation of the righteousness of God. And, further, with the sense of acceptance came the sense also of a new power—a power beyond what he had felt before—of avoiding sin, in virtue of his hearty loyalty to Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit. This part of his conception should never be lost sight of. He never teaches that faith in deliverance from “the wrath” through Christ will save unless it carry with it the willing obedience of loyalty. If Christ has freed us from the curse of the law, it is not that we might be indifferent to law, but that we may observe it better; and he felt that faith, working with regenerating grace, enabled us to do so. It is needless to point out how, in many an earnest passage, the Apostle presses home this thought.

Nor, lastly, should it be forgotten how the “Revelation” had thrown a new and consoling light on all “the suffer-

ings of the present time," which he now regarded as but the complement of the sufferings of Christ—connected with the mystery of the great atonement—serving to unite all the more the Body to the redeeming Head, and to prepare it, in union with His, for the grand consummation to come. All careful readers know how full his mind was of this idea.

The above survey, though of necessity inadequate, may help to show what we may call the rationality, as compared with many current theories, as well as the depth, of the great Apostle's view. It does not, like some, run counter to our moral sense, or conflict with our ideas of human justice. In its first broad lines it comes to this, that sin and evil having evidently and palpably, for whatever final purpose, been allowed to enter into the creation of the God of righteousness, He, in virtue of His very righteousness, has supplied a remedy—a mysterious remedy for a mysterious state of things,—but one which, when apprehended by faith, satisfies human needs. Nor does it really involve the fiction of the righteousness of one person being imputed to another; for the idea of the personal righteousness of Christ being imputed to the unrighteous is nowhere found: it is always that the righteousness of God, manifested in Christ, saves believers; their faith in Christ, with the obedience of loyalty, being reckoned unto them for righteousness. And if, finally, it be objected that there is injustice in the idea of the innocent suffering for the guilty, it may be at once replied that such is the law of things in our present human world. The most heroic deeds with the praise of which the world rings have been deeds of self-sacrifice for others; and the just, of their own accord, suffer for the unjust still. Christ's offering of Himself now stands out for ever to the eye of faith as the grand exemplar of such self-sacrifice; and it has been more potent to inspire a like spirit than anything else since the world was made.

J. BARMBY.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE FRAGMENT OF THE
ORIGINAL OF ECCLESIASTICUS EDITED BY
MR. SCHECHTER.

HAVING been invited by the Editor of the EXPOSITOR to make some observations on the interesting Fragment of the original of Ecclesiasticus, published by Mr. Schechter in the last number, I gladly take the opportunity of congratulating Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson on their latest discovery, which, though it does not eclipse, is well worthy to rank, both for interest and importance, with the most remarkable of the documents they have brought to light. It is now a matter of common knowledge that, almost simultaneously with the discovery of the leaf which Mr. Schechter has deciphered, several more belonging to the same copy, and containing in all some eight chapters, came into the hands of Dr. Neubauer, who is now actively engaged in preparing an edition of them. The discovery is not altogether unexpected, for it was always a matter of surprise that Ben-Sira's book, which had enjoyed great popularity, and which had been known to have survived the taking of Jerusalem by many centuries, should have been preserved only in indifferent translations. But it is a more than usually fortunate circumstance that the discovery should have been made while all those who took part in the controversy about this author's language (to which Mr. Schechter has alluded) are still alive; for if then we saw through a glass darkly, we may now expect to see face to face.

Until the publication of Dr. Neubauer's texts it is premature to discuss the bearing these discoveries may have on the chief points that were then in dispute. As, however, one of the disputants has hastened to declare that their evidence goes *entirely* against the theses that I formerly maintained, perhaps I may ask those whom this

controversy interests to suspend their judgment. One of the Syriacisms which I had restored from the versions is confirmed by the Fragment; חַיִּית שֵׁן for *θηρίων ὀδόντες* in xxxix. 30.¹ Perhaps this is not very important, yet the fact of Ben-Sira having this term for "wild beasts," when the author of Daniel has not, cannot fail to strike us. One other, in verse 16, פִּקְדֹן, which I had suggested as accounting for the Greek "salvation" and the Syriac "commandment," is now shown to be erroneous.² About two other restorations, which this Fragment does not confirm, something will be said in the sequel.

Most interesting is the light which this Fragment throws on the metrical theory which the writer advanced some years ago, and which obtained little favour. Those who are able to read unpointed Hebrew, and who have no prejudice either way, will allow that the following account of the evidence given by this Fragment is correct.

1. A great many verses suit the metrical scheme exactly, and many of these are hemistichs which in their Greek form gave little hope of their metrical form being restored.

(a) xxxix. 31a: "In His command they shall rejoice," ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ αὐτοῦ εὐφρανθήσονται: no literal rendering of this would have produced a tolerable verse. The Hebrew supplies an additional word of no importance to the sense, but of great importance to the metre "In His commanding them," בְּצִוְתוֹ אֹתָם יִשְׂשֹׁן and thus the scheme is maintained.

(b) xl. 5a: "Wrath and envy and trouble and unquiet-

¹ See the *Speaker's Commentary*, ad loc. Mr. Ball's note in the *Variorum Apocrypha* is directed against this. I must, however, take the opportunity of thanking him for the friendly attention accorded to my portion of the *Commentary* on Ecclesiasticus in the work cited. References throughout this article are to the numbering of the verses in Swete's edition of the LXX.

² The suggestion was put in a more modest form in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and I was wrong in altering it afterwards.

ness," θυμὸς καὶ ζήλος καὶ παραχῇ καὶ σάλος: the Hebrew shows that the word interpreted "wrath" is a corruption of a conjunction signifying "only," and that the following "and" is an interpolation. The Hebrew אַךְ קִנְיָהּ דְּאִנְיָהּ וַיִּפְדֶּךָ has perfect rhythm; but this could not have been restored from the ancient versions without arbitrariness.

(c) xxxix. 25b: "So to the sinners evils," οὕτως τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς κακά: these words seemed insufficient for a hemistich of the ordinary form, and the Syriac and Latin renderings, though giving such a hemistich, seemed unsatisfactory in sense. The Hebrew gives a correct verse, though its sense is somewhat obscure. כֵּן לְרָעִים טוֹב וְלָרָעִים.

(d) xxxix. 24a: "His ways to the holy are straight," αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὁσίοις εὐθεῖαι. The Hebrew (which like the Syriac is here corrupt) nevertheless shows that the word employed for "holy" was one which suited the metre. From the Greek it could not have been restored quite naturally. דְּרָכָיו לְתַמִּים יִשְׁרֵי.

2. It must also be admitted that many of the Hebrew lines do not suit the metrical scheme, and on the hypothesis that this Hebrew Fragment is necessarily free from corruptions, this disagreement is fatal to the metrical theory. But will any person adopt such a hypothesis? Even in the canonical books the best critics are accustomed to treating the Masoretic text and the ancient versions as witnesses out of whose various assertions the truth must be forced. And that the MS. whence this Fragment comes was carelessly written will be apparent to any one who studies it. Endeavouring then to ascertain the true reading of some of the lines on ordinary critical grounds, without prejudice either in favour of or against the metre, we shall find that when their true form is restored, they naturally fall into the metrical scheme.

(a) xxxix. 23b: (Schechter, 11b). וַיִּהְיֶה לְכַלּוֹחַ מִשְׁקָהּ.

Both the Greek and the Syriac versions invert the order of the last two words, rendering "as (Syr. 'and') he turned waters into brine." But the well-watered land was not turned into *salt*, but into *salt-land*, so that מלח should be corrected מִלְחָה. The true reading of the hemistich is then ויהפך משקה לִמְלָחָה, and this is metrical. Gesenius in the Thesaurus, s.v. מלח, restores the verse in this form, except that he wrongly gives מים for משקה.

(b) xl. 1a: (Schechter, 26a) עסק גדול חלק אל.¹ With this the Syriac agrees, and it is unmetrical. The Greek, however, has ἀσכולία μεγάλη ἔκτισται παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ, "Great vexation has been created for every man," and if the law of parallelism have any force, this rather than "God created great vexation" is the true form of the hemistich which is followed by "and a heavy yoke upon the sons of Adam." In this form the first hemistich is metrically correct:

עסק גדול חלק לכל איש.

The fact that the Greek has the nominative in both hemistichs shows that the translator had this reading before him. We notice in passing the Arabizing use of this word חלק, which this Hebrew Fragment repeatedly certifies. This will give some justification for the occasional employment of Arabisms in restoring the text where the Hebrew fragments desert us.

(c) xl. 6a (Schechter, 32a): מעט לחיק כרנע ישקוט.

The Greek has here ὀλίγον ὥς οὐδὲν ἐν ἀναπαύσει. The Hebrew Fragment shows that we have not a mistranslation but a corruption of the Greek text. The proposition ἐν, which is before ἀναπαύσει, has really lost its substantive; and ἀναπαύσει (which should rather be ἀναπαύσεται) is a verb corresponding to the Hebrew ישקוט. I do not see

¹ The marginal variant אל עליון will give a metrical hemistich, but a poor one.

why Mr. Schechter should question לַחִיק, which seems very natural in this context. Only the Greek shows us that the order of the second and third words should be inverted; and indeed it is unnatural to separate כְּרִנֵּעַ from מַעַט. The verse so restored is metrical:

מַעַט כְּרִנֵּעַ לַחִיק יִשְׁקוּט,

and I can imagine none but metrical reasons which induced the author to add לַחִיק, and to substitute מַעַט כְּרִנֵּעַ for the idiomatic כְּרִנֵּעַ רַנֵּעַ.

(d) xxxix. 15d (Schechter, 1b): וְכֵן תֹּאמַר בְּתִרְעָה.

The Greek has καὶ οὕτως ἐρεῖτε ἐν ἐξομολογήσει, and from the two authorities the true form of the verse can be restored. On the one hand it would have been arbitrary to assume that the word used for "proclamation" was the particular form which suits the metre (בְּתִרְעָה); on the other the Greek is clearly right in giving the plural rather than the singular of the verb; for both the vocative in v. 13, and all the imperatives which follow, are in the plural also. The form of the hemistich which results is metrical:

וְכֵן תֹּאמְרוּ בְּתִרְעָה.

3. Where neither text is metrical, there are cases in which both can be shown to be corrupt.

xxxix. 22, 23 (Schechter, vv. 10 and 11) read as follows in the Hebrew:

בְּרִכּוֹת (בְּרִכְתּוֹ) כִּי־אֵר הַצִּיפָה וְכִנְהָר תִּבֵּל רוֹתָה

זַעְמוֹ גּוֹיִם יוֹרִישׁ וַיַּחֲפֹךְ לַמֶּלֶךְ מִשְׁקָה

The first two are metrical; for the pointings כִּי־אֵר and בְּרִכְתּוֹ are certified by texts of the Old Testament. The omission of the first *anacrusis* is not an arbitrary supposition of mine, but a license admitted by Arabic prosody; perhaps in this context I may quote the words of the poet Abu'l-'Alā Al-Ma'arri (*Letters*, p. 112 of the Beyrout edition; p. 68, l. 26 of my forthcoming edition). "How," says the

author to his friend, "did you manage to keep clear of the licence called *Kharm*, which poets both ancient and modern agree to admit? Do you not know that Mutanabbi was most fastidious about his versification, and would alter words after they had been recited, and avoid licenses even when the metre naturally led to their employment? Yet even he employs *Kharm* in two places: لا يحزن الله الامير "ان تك طيبى كانت لياما and واني Those who can read Arabic will see that the license referred to is the same omission of the first *anacrusis* of a verse that I postulate for Ben-Sira.¹

The fourth was restored above on the ground of the consensus of the Greek and Syriac versions, and certified Hebrew usage. There remains the half-verse 23a: "so his wrath nations shall inherit" (Greek), "his wrath nations shall drive out" (Hebrew), "so in his wrath nations he judgeth" (Syriac). From the consensus of the Greek and Syriac we infer that the word "so" is wrongly omitted by the Hebrew. Otherwise the Greek text corresponds with the Hebrew, except that for the singular יוריש it substitutes the plural יורישו. Adopting this reading, we should get a line suiting the metrical scheme tolerably well; but it is nevertheless clear that the singular is a better reading than the plural on critical grounds. If therefore one of these readings be right, the preference must be given to the unmetrical one.

My belief is that neither reading is right. It seems to me that an image, similar to that of the *river* in the pre-

¹ I had supposed that the license by which the Arabic poets divide the sense or even the words between the two halves of the line was too well known to need illustration. V. 4: $\mu\tau \epsilon\lambda\pi\eta\varsigma \eta\mu\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\iota \mu\omicron\iota \epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron;$ $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota \mu\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\theta}\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$

אל תאמר חטאתי ומה כי
היה כי אל ארך אפים

shows that Ben-Sira allowed himself the first of these liberties, and we may assume that he allowed himself the second.

ceding verse, is imperatively required both by what precedes and what follows. Just as the Divine blessing is like a river that overflows and fertilizes the soil, so the Divine wrath is like a . . . that turns the fertile land into a barren waste. A trace of the true reading seems to me preserved in the Syriac "judges." This, as Mr. Schechter observes, probably stands for שפט; and this can with ease be emended שטף—*overflows*—just the word that we require. That which *overflows*, and, instead of fertilizing, turns the land into salt-land, would seem to be the *sea*—and this is preserved in the second half of the word rendered "nations." I should emend the whole verse, therefore,—

בְּנֵי זַעֲמֹה כִּי־שֹׁטֵף יִשְׁטֹף,

where the addition of the infin. absol. seems to me required by the idiom as well as by the metre.

So far, therefore, as the metre is concerned, the verses restored to us in this fragment may be divided roughly into three classes: verses which correspond with the metrical scheme; verses which, when corrected in accordance with the ancient versions, correspond with it; and verses which disagree with it according to all the authorities, but which can be shown on critical grounds to be corrupt. I do not assert that this division is exhaustive; but, for my part, the study of this fragment has strengthened me in the belief that my metrical analysis of Ben-Sira's verses is substantially correct.

Before proceeding to speak of the Aramaisms which this Fragment does not confirm, I will add one to the mediæval reminiscences of Ecclesiasticus collected by Mr. Schechter, and request the reader to consider the passage in detail. In the *Sahih*, or collection of Traditions of the Prophet Mohammed, compiled by Muslim (ninth century), we find the following: "There are three," said the prophet, "whom God will not address on the Day of Judgment

. . . *an old adulterer, and a lying king, and a poor man who is proud.*" We can have no doubt of the source of this saying if we compare Ecclesiasticus xxv. 2—"Three sorts my soul hateth, and I am greatly offended by their life: *a poor man that is proud, a rich man that is a liar, and an old adulterer that doateth.*" We cannot be sure that the person who put this saying into Mohammed's mouth got it from the Jewish tradition; but, as it is one of those of which the original Hebrew is preserved, and which, therefore, circulated independently, this may be regarded as probable. The Hebrew form of the saying occurs, as has often been pointed out, in Talm. Bab., Pesahim 113b:

דַּל בָּאָה וְעָשִׂיר מְכַחֵשׁ וּזְקֵן כִּנְאָף וּפְרָנָס מִתְנַאֵה

עַל הַצְבוּר בַּחֲנָם

—"a poor man who is proud, a rich man who lies, an old man who commits adultery, and an official who, without ground, sets himself above the community."

We have then apparently the original of the words of Ben-Sira, and yet we cannot well credit him with the sentiment contained in the text. What writer of respectable morals would have placed an old *adulterer* on a level with the other characters mentioned in the passage? In a poor man, lying (according to Juvenal) is a peccadillo; even if he perjures himself, the gods will wink at the offence. That wealth naturally produces pride was also the opinion of the ancient moralists. If, therefore, a poor man lies, and a rich man is proud, reprehensible as their conduct is, it excites in the mind of the moralist no special indignation. But in what state of life is *adultery* a venial offence?—for let it be observed that neither the Greek nor the Hebrew of the passage allows us to substitute a less obnoxious notion for this deadly sin. It is clear that there is no such state, and Ben-Sira cannot have written this; although, if the Hebrew of chap. xxv. be found in

the same recension as Mr. Schechter's Fragment, it is probable that it will agree with the Rabbinical quotation.

To find out what Ben-Sira can have meant, let us go to the other sources for the reconstruction of his text. And in the first place the Syriac gives us a natural and proper sentiment in place of that which we condemn, substituting for "an old adulterer" "*an old man that is a fool and wanting knowledge.*" And the same is given by some Greek MSS., one substituting the word "fool" (μωρόν) for "adulterer" (μοιχόν), one putting the words "adulterer" and "fool" side by side; and so also the Old Latin *senem fatuum et insensatum*. *Folly and ignorance* in an old man are as inexcusable as lying in a rich one, or boastfulness in a poor one. Reprehensible in all cases, in that of an old man they are also inappropriate.

If this be so, why have half or more of the authorities "adulterer" for "fool"? The reason I suggest is the following. The New Hebrew for fool is שוטה *shoteh*, a word as characteristic of the Rabbinical language as עסק, which Ben-Sira is known to have employed repeatedly. The word used by the Biblical language for "to commit adultery" (of a woman), is שטה, *satah*, whence the Rabbinical for adulteress *sotah* (ordinarily spelt with ס). In the ancient copies of Ben-Sira the word was probably שוטה, which might be read "fool" or "adulteress." The Syriac translator, familiar with the word from his own language, renders it correctly. The Greek translator, a poor scholar, renders it *adulterer*; but later correctors of his work insert the true rendering on the margin. The ancient editor of the Hebrew text, misreading as the Greek translator did, "adulteress," substitutes the classical Hebrew for "adulterer" (מְנַאֲרֵה). And in this last form the verse gets circulated, to the discredit, it must be owned, of those who have cited it with approval.

But there is another point to be noticed before we quit

this verse. The Hebrew ends (the list of three) with the "old adulterer," but the Greek and Syriac add the words "wanting in wisdom"; and the agreement of these two authorities makes it highly probable that this addition formed part of the original text. What is the significance of these extra words? Why should Ben-Sira have spoiled the terseness of his epigram by adding them? It is difficult to think of any reason for the addition, until we observe that the true words for "an old adulterer," together with the text which this addition naturally represents, give us a line of the same rhythm as the first half-verse preserved in the Rabbinic quotation.¹ That observation indeed supplies us with a very adequate reason for their insertion; for in all ancient poetry the insertion of words which fill the metre, but only slightly affect the sense, is exceedingly common. But if Ben-Sira inserted words in order to conform to a metrical standard, he must have been consciously writing in metre; and we shall be entitled to search in other parts of his work for the same rhythm as we have detected in this verse. The nature of the Rabbinical quotation does not prove that there was no metre in Ecclesiasticus, but only that at an early period the law of its metre was forgotten.²

דג נאח וְעִשִׂיר מִכֶּשֶׁת וּזְקֵן שׁוֹטֵט חֶסֶד בִּינָה 1

² No attempt has as yet been made to reply to this argument. But yet there must be some reason why—*e.g.* in the enumeration xxxix. 26—"wine" should be described as "the blood of the grape," and "corn" likewise given two words; and it is from observations of this sort that facts can be learnt. So in the line immediately preceding that which we have been discussing, *καὶ προσώχθισα σφόδρα τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν*, Heb. (probably) וְקִצְתִּי מֵאֵד בְּחַיֵּיהֶם, metrical necessity will account for the substitution of "their life" for "them"; but scarcely anything else. In the preceding hemistich, "three sorts my soul hateth," the substitution of "my soul" for "I" has probably the same reason. That lines of many words like iv. 22a, *συντρήρησον καιρὸν καὶ φύλαξαι ἀπὸ πονηροῦ* (שָׁמַר עַתָּה וְהִשָּׁמַר מִרָעָה); the last word was rather (מִכִּבְיָ"ח), should fall naturally into the same rhythm as those of few words, like viii. 10, *μὴ ἔκκαίῃς ἀνθρώπους ἀμαρτωλοῦ* (see Syriac), cannot to my mind be accidental.

The consideration to which this little discussion leads is whether the text supplied by these fragments of the tenth or eleventh century must necessarily supersede that which can be restored from the versions; or whether, even where its testimony is unfavourable, ground already won can be defended against it. To take an example of what seems to me a certain restoration—in viii. 10 the Greek has “the coals of the wicked,” the Syriac “the perfectly wicked,” whence it follows that the original had for “coals” the word *gumrē*, which is found in Rabbinical Hebrew, but is unknown to the classical language. If a Hebrew MS. of this passage were discovered, and it were found to contain some classical expression for “coals,” what should we infer? The right inference would probably be that this MS. contained an interpolated text.

Let us apply this consideration to one of the verses as they appear in the fragment published by Mr. Schechter. In xxxix. 16 the Greek has “all the works of the Lord that they are good exceedingly”; the Syriac, “all the works of the Lord are fair together.” Since there is a Chaldee word meaning “exceedingly” which could easily be misinterpreted “together,” the present writer restored it as the last word of the verse; and he also found that with this word the metrical scheme was satisfied. While then the variety of the Greek and the Syriac renderings was accounted for by the hypothesis that the word לְחֶדָּה had occurred in the original text, the metrical scheme gave a sufficient reason for the employment of this Chaldaism instead of the ordinary Hebrew כִּמְאֵד, which would suit the Greek, though not the Syriac version. A MS. of the Hebrew has now been discovered, and it contains no adverb at all. When therefore I hear the taunt of the adversary, “You were positive that לְחֶדָּה occurred in the original of that verse; I told you that it did not; and now see which was right!” is there any answer that I can with modesty

make? Perhaps there is. The whole affair is a question of probability. On the one hand, the metrical theory may be a delusion, and the Greek and Syriac versions may have conspired to deceive us. On the other hand, the Hebrew recension may be corrupt. The same interpolator whom we detected in the act of substituting כְּנִיאָה for שִׁמְרָה may have banished the Chaldaic adverb from the verse. When the metrical law had been forgotten, words of this sort would easily drop out.

The other Aramaism which "ought to appear, but does not," is of less importance; for it was rightly pointed out by Prof. Noeldeke that the word כִּפֵּן occurs in the Hebrew of Job, and that therefore I was not justified in claiming it for my thesis. The Hebrew (Schechter, 18a) by omitting an "and" restores the metre, so that the thesis gains something from it; and since the form כִּפֵּן accounts for both the Greek and Syriac renderings, I am inclined to think it was the word employed by Ben-Sira, the word רַע which appears in the text being the remains of a variant inserted by some one who preferred the more strictly Hebrew synonym.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE DERIVATION OF PURIM.

RENAN, in his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, following P. de Lagarde, derives Purim from the Persian. The Jews, according to this view, adopted the Farwardigân Festival, discarding its religious peculiarities, and celebrated it in the twelfth month as a purely secular festival. They called it in Aramaic *Pourdai*, and in Hebrew *Fourdîm*: the latter, whether by errors in transcription or some process of phonetic decay, became Purim.

Zimmern, in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1891, sought a derivation from the Assyrian *puhru*. At the same time he derived the festival from the Babylonian New Year Feast.

He suggested the identity of Mordechai with Marduk, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, and regarded the Book of Esther as a romantic development of the old theme of Marduk and Tiamat, or Bel and the Dragon.

Halévy, in the *Revue des Études Juives* for 1887, ably combatted the derivation from the Persian proposed by Lagarde, and decided for a meaning "lot." Oppert, in the same Review for 1894, however, strongly supports a Persian influence, and enumerates a long list of the proper names which he considers Persian. He also gives as the derivation of Purim the Persian *pura*. What the original meaning of this *pura* may be, he does not show; but merely remarks that the Book of Esther establishes its meaning as "lot." Oppert argues throughout that the Book of Esther has a real historical foundation. Whatever we may think of the origin of the feast itself — whether Persian or native Babylonian, it seems to me that Zimmern and Halévy are correct in protesting against the Persian etymology. The Jews may well have kept up a feast in which they had long shared at the New Year in Babylon, and could do so without reproach, as it was the Feast of Accessions, the event from which the tenure of office dated for all the magistrates of the State. That they had the additional reasons given in the Book of Esther, need not come into question here.

Now this suggests a much simpler derivation for Purim than any mentioned above. The Assyrian word *puru* probably means "term of office," "turn," in German *mal*, in French *fois*. This has just been made plain by Peiser in the fourth volume of the *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek*, page 107. Two private contracts exist in the British Museum, dated in the eponymy of Beldānan (Rm. 2. 19, and K. 378). At the end of the date in each case are added the words "ina šanê purišu." They are therefore dated in the eponymy of Bêldānan "in his second *puru*." Now

Bêldânan was eponym B.C. 744, and again B.C. 734. Each time he was, as also on these two tablets, prefect of Kalah. It seems certain that this note must mean that the date was B.C. 734, when he was prefect and eponym the second time. Peiser, therefore, renders "ina šanê purišu" by "in seiner zweiten Amtszeit." As he further shows, this new word *puru* and its rendering make clear an obscure point in the inscription of Shalmaneser II.

Now as the eponyms and all other magistrates, not excluding the king himself, entered upon their offices at the New Year, it seems reasonable to conclude that while on its religious side the Feast was called Farwardigân by the Persians, Zagmuku, or Akitu by the Babylonians, Gula Feast in Nineveh, on its civil side it was the Feast of the *Puru*, or Accession Day for all officials. If so, the name could be well adopted, as it was secular in its view, and had no inseparable connexion with heathen rites.

Whether this Assyrian *puru* had anything to do with "lots" I cannot pretend to decide. At least the eponyms could not have been chosen by lot in the earlier days, for they followed a regular cycle of towns or offices. In the latter days of the Assyrian empire this cycle seems to have completely fallen into abeyance; and no fixed order of sequence is discoverable. Whether at Babylon under the native empire lots played any part in the selection of officers of the State, I am not aware. Whether, indeed, the Persians borrowed the name Purim and gave it a turn of their own, I do not know. The derivations hitherto proposed are as speculative as mine, and they are not very successful as philological attempts. This derivation leaves untouched, as it seems to me, the questions as to the historical value of the Book of Esther. Neither the Persian *pura*, which may not exist, nor the Assyrian *puḫru*, "assembly," seems equally likely. For Zimmern seems

conscious of the difficulty in the disappearance of the rough guttural *h*: further it is a far cry from "assembly" to "lots."

In any case my derivation is Semitic, and it involves no long descent in meaning from *puru*, "turn," "time," "term of office," to a good sense for Purim, nor even to a meaning "lot" for that word.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE publication of the Revised Version of the Apocrypha¹ completes the work of the revisers. Most of the more important books were translated by committees of the New Testament Company, but 1 and 2 Esdras, the additions to Esther, Baruch, the Song of the Three Children, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and the Prayer of Manasses were undertaken by a committee of the Old Testament Company. The text is for the most part that of A.V., but in 2 Esdras use has been made of Professor Bensly's reconstruction of the text, and vii. 36-105, the Latin text of which was discovered by him, and published in 1875, has been included in the translation. As regards form, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the poems in Tobit and Judith have been printed according to the parallelism of sense in the originals—an arrangement which makes these passages much more intelligible and readable. The changes in the translation—as far as we have been able to examine them—give the sense of the original not only more accurately, but also more vividly, than the A.V. It is to be hoped that this publication will powerfully stimulate the growing interest in the Apocrypha. Many of the books possess great intrinsic interest and literary merit; the Maccabees

¹ The Apocrypha, being the version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1894. Oxford University Press, 1895.

are almost our only authority for one of the greatest crises in the history of Revealed Religion; some knowledge of the Apocrypha is essential to the right understanding of our Canonical Scriptures; these books were part of the Bible of the Middle Ages, and created a powerful influence on the development of theology, and for a very large part of Christendom they are still part of the Bible.

This last instalment of the revisers' work adds very considerably to the debt due to them by the English-speaking peoples. Like all emended translations of the Bible, this revision has had arrayed against it great vested interests, commercial, homiletic, dogmatic. The reception given to the Revised Version by the general public is easily summarized; the New Testament version was blamed for its merits, the Old Testament has been praised for its defects. Those who should have been its friends have often been more anxious to show how it might have been made better than to recognise how good it was. Nevertheless, history cannot fail to acknowledge the immense services which the Revised Version has already rendered, and will continue to render, to the religious life and thought of England.

From the Apocalypse it is an easy transition to a pseudepigraph "of whose existence there had never been even a surmise in the world of scholarship, and to which there was not a single unmistakable allusion in all ancient literature" (pref. viii.)—*The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*.¹ This is an entirely different work from the well-known Book of Enoch, and doubtless one reason why it has been so entirely lost sight of is that it was confounded with the more famous work, and references to the Book of the Secrets was supposed to refer to the Book of Enoch. The new work is now extant in five Slavonic MSS.—three of

¹ *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, translated from the Slavonic by W. R. Morfill, M.A., and edited, with introduction and notes, by R. H. Charles, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, pp. xlviii., 100, 7s. 6d.

which contain a "shortened and incomplete redaction"—of the 16th and 17th centuries. The editor, Mr. R. H. Charles, the great English authority on the Ethiopic Enoch, decides that this Slavonic Enoch was originally composed in Egypt, probably at Alexandria, by an orthodox Hellenistic Jew, between A.D. 1-50, and that it was written in Greek. The author, however, made use of an earlier work in Hebrew. It contains very close parallels to Matthew v. 9, 34, 35, 37, xxv. 34; Luke vi. 35; John xiv. 2; Hebrews xi. 3; Revelation x. 5, 6, and Mr. Charles is inclined to think that the work was known to New Testament writers, and states also that: "Some form of the Slavonic Enoch seems to have been in Mohammed's hands." He notices many parallels between the Ethiopic and the Slavonic Enoch, but does not discuss their relationship at any length; possibly he intends to do so in some later publication. The plan and subject-matter of the Slavonic Enoch have much in common with the Ethiopic Enoch. Enoch, after his translation, is conducted through the seven heavens, where he witnesses the bliss of the righteous, and also—curiously enough—the sufferings of the lost. Hell is a kind of department of heaven. God reveals to him the secrets of the universe in a discourse which is an expansion of the opening chapters of Genesis, and makes him write down his experiences in 366—or 360, the MSS. vary—books. He then returns to earth, tells his children what he has seen and heard, gives them the books, exhorts them at great length, and is finally translated to heaven.

One of Mr. Charles's MSS. also contains a fragmentary version of the Melchizedek myth, including an account of Melchizedek's birth, which is a grotesque and repulsive parody of the Gospel of the Infancy. Probably Mr. Charles's opinions as to the date, etc., of the Book of the Secrets of Enoch will not be accepted without discussion.

For instance, the parallels with New Testament passages may be Christian interpolations. In any case, however, this discovery makes an important addition to our knowledge of the first century A.D.

Prof. Findlay, who is well known for his work as a New Testament scholar, contributes a work on the Prophets¹ to the Wesleyan series of "Books for Bible Students." This is the first of three volumes on the Prophets, and includes those whose ministry came before the Fall of Samaria, *i.e.*, according to Prof. Findlay, Obadiah, Joel, the author of Isaiah xv., xvi., Amos, Hosea, Zechariah, ix.-xi., Micah. It will be evident, even from this list, that Prof. Findlay accepts the principles and results of modern criticism. Where he differs from prevalent views, *e.g.*, as to the date of Obadiah, Joel, and Zechariah ix.-xi., he does so on critical and not on apologetic grounds, and he usually states the alternative views side by side with his own. This book contains much useful information in a compact form, which it will probably introduce into circles where Driver's Introduction is tabooed. It is a valuable addition to the series to which it belongs.

The latest of the "Little Books of Religion" is Dr. Marcus Dods' *Visions of a Prophet*,² which consists of eight practical and devotional studies based on the visions contained in the Book of Zechariah. It will be most helpful and suggestive as a manual of private devotion, and we trust it will be widely read. Obviously such a work is also useful to the teacher and preacher.

We have next two works on the Book of Genesis: one is a new edition of Mr. Spurrell's very useful notes on the

¹ *The Books of the Prophets in their Historical Succession*, by George G. Findlay, B.A., Tutor in Biblical Literature, Headingley College, vol. i. To the Fall of Samaria. London: C. H. Kelly, 1896, pp. xiv., 297.

² *The Visions of a Prophet: Studies in Zechariah*, by Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895, pp. viii., 185.

Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis.¹ It is most encouraging to find that this book, which appeals solely to Hebrew students, has got into a second edition. A large amount of new matter is incorporated in this new edition, viz., an Introduction of 64 pages on the composition of the book, crowded with information, and 40 pages of additions to notes and new notes. Nowhere else are the interests of the Hebrew student of Genesis cared for in such a thorough and scholarly fashion. The other book on Genesis² is by Prof. Wade, of Lampeter; it is "intended chiefly for English readers . . . and the discussion of matters of pure scholarship has been purposely avoided." This book is specially interesting as an edition of Genesis with introduction and brief notes, accepting and expounding the documentary theory of the Pentateuch; and, at the same time, carefully adapted to the needs of English readers who are entirely innocent of Hebrew. Prof. Wade is moderate and cautious, but he substantially adheres to the theory, which arranges the documents in the order JE, D, P. The text is arranged in two columns, on the left P, on the right J, JE, or E, as the case may be. When J and E are closely and minutely interwoven, JE is printed as it stands in the Hebrew text, without any attempt at analysis. Prof. Wade has carefully followed leading authorities, and this volume is a useful popular introduction to the methods and results of the analysis of the Pentateuch.

In *Memphis and Mycenæ*³ Mr. Cecil Torr, who is an authority on classical antiquities, examines the Egyptian evidence for the statement that the Mycenæan age in

¹ *Notes on the Text of the Book of Genesis*, by G. J. Spurrell, M.A., formerly Hebrew Lecturer at Wadham College, Oxford. Second edition, revised and corrected. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896, pp. lxiv., 416, 800. 10s. 6d.

² *The Book of Genesis*, by G. W. Wade, M.A., Professor of Latin at St. David's College, Lampeter. London: Hodder Bros., 1896, pp. viii., 261. 5s.

³ *Memphis and Mycenæ*, an examination of Egyptian Chronology and its application to the early history of Greece, by Cecil Torr, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1896, pp. x., 74. 5s.

Greece can be definitely fixed at 1500 B.C. He comes to the conclusion that "there certainly is nothing to justify the confident assertion that the Mycenæan age in Greece was concurrent with the eighteenth dynasty in Egypt, and that this dynasty began in 1700." On Egyptian evidence he concludes that dynasty 18 must have begun in 1271 B.C. at latest, dynasty 20 about B.C. 1000 at latest, dynasty 12 about 1500 B.C. at latest. He admits that these dynasties may have begun at earlier dates, but that it is impossible to prove any earlier dates. Now Prof. Flinders Petrie, in his recent *History of Egypt*, vol. i., dates the beginning of the 18th dynasty in B.C. 1587, and of the 12th dynasty in B.C. 2778; and states, pp. vi., vii., that "the range of uncertainty may be about a century in the earlier parts of this volume, diminishing to about a generation by the close of the volume." The volume includes dynasties 1-16, but also gives a table of the dynasties extending to the 18th. The reader will remember that Prof. Petrie has published, in a recent number of the *Contemporary*, a translation of a newly discovered inscription of Merenptah II., better known as Menephthah II., and, according to a widely accepted theory, the "Pharaoh of the Exodus." In his article Prof. Petrie gives B.C. 1200 as an ascertained date in Merenptah's reign. Mr. Torr would apparently deny that there is any strong evidence for making Merenptah's reign begin earlier than about B.C. 1028, p. 43, though he admits that his evidence merely fixes 1028 as the latest possible date for this accession. Mr. Torr devotes a chapter to showing that the astronomical evidence, on which Prof. Petrie and others largely rely, is worthless: "there is very little hope of correcting any dates in history by reference to the cycles of the phoenix and the dog-star, or other things belonging to the calendar. And there is still less hope of learning anything at all from the orientation of the temples. No building can be planned in such a way

as to prevent its axis from pointing to some heavenly body at some date or other." It will be interesting to see if Mr. Torr obtains any allies from among the experts in Egyptology whose dominions he has invaded.

Mr. Compton's *Sacrifice*¹ is an attempt to interpret Old Testament sacrifices so that they may lead up to and connect with the Eucharist, which also is discussed and expounded from the standpoint of a moderate Sacramentarianism. The Eucharist is a "cooked Minchah . . . with its great appendage of wine." The book belongs to a region of thought entirely free from the taint of any reference to such researches as those of the late Robertson Smith. Prof. Moulton gives us *Proverbs*² in a dainty little volume, in which type, arrangement and headings do their best to further the reading and study of the Revised Version.

Dr. Anderson's book on *Daniel*³ is a fierce attack on critics in general and Dean Farrar in particular.

Sir J. W. Dawson's *Eden*⁴ consists of material already familiar to our readers, being a reprint of articles published in THE EXPOSITOR.

¹ *Sacrifice*, by Berdmore Compton, late Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street. Jas. Parker & Co. London: 1896, pp. viii., 118. 2s. 6d.

² *The Proverbs*, edited by R. G. Moulton, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Literature in English University of Chicago. Macmillan & Co., New York and London, 1895, pp. xxiv., 193.

³ *Daniel in the Critic's Den*, by Robert Anderson, LL.D., Barrister-at-Law, Assistant Commissioner of Police in the Metropolis. Wm. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London, 1895, pp. ix., 126. 3s. 6d.

⁴ *Eden Lost and Won*, by Sir J. William Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., etc. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895, pp. viii., 226.

THE INCARNATION :

A STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11.

IF an apology is needed for adding to the numberless attempts to determine the true meaning of St. Paul's words in this celebrated passage, it may be found in the fact that we still meet with the widest diversities of interpretation in the current theology of the day.¹

There is, however, one point on which all are agreed, namely, that the passage is of primary importance in relation to the fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, the Incarnation of the Son of God.

But even among those who profess to base their interpretations upon a strict examination of the Apostle's language there seems to be as yet no general agreement either as to the meaning of the most important words, or as to the grammatical construction and logical connexion of the

¹ An interesting example of this wide divergence of opinion between able and learned theologians occurs in a review in *The Guardian*, January 1st, 1896, of Canon Gore's *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, Murray, 1895: "The next step in the argument is the discussion of the famous passage in St. Paul (*Phil.* ii. 5-11). Here Mr. Gore takes 'form' in both cases in its strict technical sense, and in this we cannot but think that he falls into an error, which, if it be an error, is one of a highly misleading kind. 'Form of God' in the sense of 'essence or specific character of God' is a phrase that no Greek philosopher, except, perhaps, the materialists, ever permitted himself to employ, and, as servitude is a mere relation, 'essence of a slave' is a phrase of no meaning. St. Paul must have been using the word 'form' in a loose, popular sense, as we use the word 'nature.' 'Form of a slave' is defined here by the words 'likeness' and 'fashion,' which immediately follow, as the 'emptying' is defined by 'obedience unto death.'

"There is room, no doubt, for much variety of opinion, but the correct exegesis is the strictest, and in any case the wise interpreter will be very shy of erecting a 'Kenosis doctrine' on a phrase the exact limits of which no man can fix with precise accuracy."

passage. There is, in fact, little improvement in these respects since the author of an elaborate and important treatise on the subject declared that "the diversity of opinion prevailing among interpreters in regard to the meaning of the principal passage bearing on the subject of Christ's humiliation—that, namely, in the second chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians—is enough to fill the student with despair, and to afflict him with intellectual paralysis." ¹

i. *The Context.*

In approaching the interpretation of a passage so full of acknowledged difficulties, it is desirable first to notice briefly its connexion with the preceding context. There the Apostle's purpose is happily too clear to be obscured by any diversity of interpretation. St. Paul has been encouraging his beloved converts at Philippi to "stand fast in one spirit, with one soul, striving for the faith of the Gospel." He entreats them to make his joy in them complete by adding to their faith and courage the crowning graces of humility and self-denying love. He pleads with them by every motive of Christian fellowship, and not least by their personal affection for himself, and their sympathy with his sufferings in behalf of Christ, to "be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind." "Let nothing," he says, "be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than himself. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus."

These earnest and loving entreaties the Apostle proceeds to enforce, by setting forth our Blessed Lord Himself as the supreme example of humility, self-sacrifice, and love; and he is thus led on to speak of those deepest and holiest

¹ The Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 11.

mysteries of the Christian Faith, the Incarnation of the Son of God, His voluntary self-abasement, His obedience "even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross." In order that this view of the general connexion of the passage may help to guide us to a right interpretation, the point which must especially be borne in mind is, that the Incarnation and human life of our Lord are set before us as the perfect example of the principle enjoined in *v.* 4, "Not looking each to his own things, but each also to the things of others."

ii. *The Subject.*

In passing to the direct interpretation of our passage, we have to notice, first, that there has been much discussion whether Christ, as denoted by the relative pronoun *ὅς*, is regarded only in His life on earth, or also as the Eternal Word, which "was in the beginning with God, and was God."

In answer to this question we might too easily be tempted to argue, as Meyer does, that "*ὅς* denotes the subject of what follows; consequently Christ Jesus, but in the *pre-human state*, in which He the Son of God . . . was with God"; the *human state* being first introduced by the words in *v.* 7, "He emptied Himself."

In arguing thus we should assume by anticipation a meaning in what follows which as yet remains to be proved. It is therefore safer and more strictly correct to say with Hofmann, in his Commentary on the Epistle, that "the Apostle, speaking of Him who was known to His readers under the name of Christ Jesus, asserts something which He did when in a state of existence described as *being in the form of God.*"

iii. *ὑπάρχων*: (a) *Pre-existence.*

(a) The meaning given to *ὑπάρχων* in the margin of the Revised Version (Gr., *being originally*) is so generally

recognised among scholars, that we need not dwell upon it, except to point out that this sense is strongly marked in several passages of St. Paul's epistles.

1 Cor. xi. 7 : "*For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is (ὑπάρχων) the image and glory of God.*"

Here the word evidently points to what man is by his original creation in the image of God.

2 Cor. viii. 17 : "*For indeed he accepted our exhortation ; but being himself (ὑπάρχων) very earnest, he went forth unto you of his own accord.*"

Here "himself" is not expressed by a separate word in the Greek, nor does it appear in the Authorised Version, but has been rightly added by the Revisers, to bring out the meaning of ὑπάρχων.

On Galatians ii. 14, "*If thou being a Jew livest as do the Gentiles,*" Bishop Lightfoot remarks that Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων is "very emphatic," "born and bred a Jew." So Meyer, "although a born Jew"; and Howson (*Speaker's Commentary*) : "The Greek means more than this ('being'), and denotes that he was 'a Jew by birth,' a Jew *to begin with.*"

It is interesting to observe how forcibly this meaning is brought out in the very ancient *Liturgy of St. James* : καὶ παιδίον γέγονεν ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων ὑπάρχων Θεὸς ἡμῶν.¹

This well-established meaning of ὑπάρχων at once excludes the many attempts which have been made to limit the description, *being in the form of God*, to the time of Christ's sojourn upon earth.

In this latter sense it has been thought, for instance, to refer to the divine majesty and power which Jesus manifested during His ministry, either in His miracles, or generally in His words and works, as when St. John says

¹ Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 45.

(i. 14): "*We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.*"

Others have referred "*the form of God*" to some special manifestation of divine glory, such as occurred at His Baptism¹ and Transfiguration.

Against all such interpretations it is sufficient to reply, that the meaning of *ὑπάρχων*, in its connexion with the following context, clearly implies a state existing prior to the point of time at which our Lord *took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.*

iii. *ὑπάρχων*: (b) *Continued Existence.*

This brings us to a second question, which, though not less essential to the right interpretation of *ὑπάρχων ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ* in its relation to the context, has been either altogether overlooked or misunderstood even by the best scholars and interpreters.

Thus Bishop Lightfoot, to whom every student of this epistle is so deeply indebted, and who is usually so extremely accurate, writes as follows:² "Before attempting to discover what is implied by *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, it will be necessary to clear the way by disposing of a preliminary question. Does the expression *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* refer to the pre-incarnate or to the incarnate Christ?"

This statement of the question is evidently incomplete, and in fact misleading. It assumes that the clause must refer *exclusively* either to Christ's pre-existent state or to His incarnate state: it thus excludes the obvious and most important alternative, that it *may apply to both.*

In the present tendency of theological speculation concerning *the fulness of the Godhead* in the Incarnate Christ,

¹ Dr. Resch, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Band v., Heft 4, AGRAPHIA, pp. 367 ff., argues from the language of the ancient Syriac Baptismal Office of Severus that "*the form of God*" refers to the glorification of Christ in the waters of Jordan.

² *Philippians*, Ed. 1891, p. 131.

and the opposite doctrine of *Kenotism*, it is much to be regretted that the third alternative was not taken into consideration by so eminent an interpreter of St. Paul as the late Bishop of Durham. The omission appears to have arisen from an idea that *ὑπάρχων* must "be referred to a *point of time* prior to the Incarnation."

This expression "*point of time*" (the italics are mine) occurs three times on pp. 131, 132; and its use prejudges the interpretation of the whole passage by implying, unconsciously perhaps on the Bishop's part, that "*the form of God*" did not continue during the ministry on earth.

The true force of the participle *ὑπάρχων* is well expressed by Dean Gwynn in his admirable interpretation of the epistle in the *Speaker's Commentary*: "Its tense (Imperfect) contrasted with the following Aorists points to indefinite *continuance* of being."

I hope to show that this meaning is fully confirmed (1) by the nature of the Imperfect tense, (2) by the use of *ὑπάρχων* in the New Testament and especially in the writings of St. Paul, and (3) by the testimony of very early Christian writers.

(1) Jelf, *Greek Grammar*, § 395: "The Imperfect is to time past what the Present is to time present; both express an action yet in course of performance, and not yet completed"; or, we may add, a *state* in course of continuance not yet ended.

Green, *Grammar of New Testament Dialect*, p. 10: "The essential time signified by the PRESENT and IMPERFECT Tenses is that of a continued or habitually repeated action." Compare p. 100: "The Participle conveys 'the idea of essential time belonging to the particular tense from which the participle is derived.'"

(2) (α') This general property of the imperfect participle may be illustrated first by the use of *ὧν* in the New Testament in combination with an Aorist. John xi. 49:

ἀρχιεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. John xxi. 19: τοσούτων ὄντων οὐκ ἐσχίσθη τὸ δίκτυον.

Would it be reasonable to say that the *states* indicated by the participles ὢν and ὄντων ceased when the action described by the finite verbs occurred?

For other examples see Winer, § xlv. 1, (2), *b*.

(β') But it will be more satisfactory to observe the use of ὑπάρχων itself. Luke xxiii. 50: Ἰωσήφ βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων . . . οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πειλάτῳ ᾗτήσατο τὸ σῶμα. Acts ii. 30: προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων . . . προειδὼν ἐλάλησεν.

Are we to suppose that Joseph of Arimathea ceased to be a "counsellor" as soon as he *begged the body of Jesus*, or David a prophet when he *spoke of the resurrection of Christ*?

(γ') The most complete proof of all is St. Paul's own use of ὑπάρχων. 2 Cor. viii. 17: σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων αὐθαίρετος ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. . . . xii. 16: ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων πανουργὸς δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον.

Did Titus cease to be zealous at the moment of starting to visit the Corinthians?

Or does St. Paul mean, in his ironical statement, that, in the opinion of the Corinthians, he ceased to be crafty as soon as he had once caught them with guile? It is impossible, I think, to find or imagine passages more exactly parallel in grammatical construction to Philippians ii. 6 than these two examples of St. Paul's own use of ὑπάρχων.

Another strictly parallel passage is Romans iv. 19: κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα [ἤδη] νενεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταέτης πονῶν ὑπάρχων.

In this case it would be manifestly absurd to say that the state indicated by ὑπάρχων ("being about a hundred years old") ceased when Abraham "*considered his own body as good as dead.*"

The only other instances of ὑπάρχων in St. Paul's

writings are 1 Corinthians xi. 7; Galatians i. 14, ii. 14, which are not so exactly parallel to Philippians ii. 6, because in them *ὑπάρχων* is not combined with an Aorist; but in neither of them is there anything to indicate an immediate cessation of the state described by the participial clause.

So far then as the principles of grammatical construction and the writer's usage are concerned, it is unreasonable to assume that Christ ceased to be "*in the form of God*," when He "*emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant*."

(3) The true meaning of *ὑπάρχων* is clearly seen in a very early, seemingly the earliest, direct quotation of Philippians ii. 6, in the celebrated letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to their Christian brethren in Asia (Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, v. c. 20).

Those who had suffered torture in the persecution are thus described :

"They were so zealous in their imitation of Christ, *who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be on an equality with God*,—that though they were (*ὑπάρχοντες*) in such honour, and had borne witness not once nor twice, but many times,—having been brought back to prison from the wild beasts covered with burns and scars and wounds,—yet they neither proclaimed themselves martyrs, nor suffered us to address them by that name."

These men are held up as zealous imitators of Christ's humility in refusing the title which really belonged to them. Had they ceased to be held in honour as martyrs, there could have been no humility in not proclaiming or accepting the title. Only as having been and still being (*ὑπάρχοντες*) in honour could they be said to imitate Christ's humility.

That *ὑπάρχων* was considered by the Greek Fathers to include this idea of continuance, is clear from their constant

interpretation of the passage as proving that Christ was at once both God and Man.

It is enough for the present to quote a passage from S. Chrysostom's Commentary on the Epistle, *Hom. vi. § 3*, by which the full meaning of the word is well illustrated: *Διὰ τί μὴ εἶπεν, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ γενόμενος, ἀλλ', Ὑπάρχων; Ἰσον ἐστὶ τοῦτο τῷ εἰπεῖν, Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ὁ Ὡν.*

The omission to notice this meaning of continued existence in *ὑπάρχων* is one of several causes tending to the erroneous view that what Christ laid aside was the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*.

iv. ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ.

Of the phrase "*form of God*" there are two distinct and opposite interpretations, even among those who agree with what has been shown above, that it describes something which Christ already possessed before His Incarnation.

By some "*the form of God*" is limited to "the divine appearance" of which Christ by His Incarnation "divested Himself,"¹ "the former divinely glorious position which He afterwards gave up,"² "the glory visible at the throne of God."³

In this sense it is said to be "not essentially different" from τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ. This latter "must in substance denote the same thing, namely, the divine *habitus* of Christ, which is expressed, as to its *form of appearance*, by ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, and, as to its internal nature, by τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ."⁴

In this interpretation, which will be fully discussed below, the "form" or condition expressed by *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, however glorious and majestic, is regarded as separable,

¹ Meyer's Commentary (Eng. Trs.), p. 78.

² p. 79.

³ p. 80.

⁴ Meyer, p. 81 fin.

and, at the Incarnation, actually separated from the essential and unchangeable nature of God.

I have referred to Meyer, because he appears to be the ablest supporter of this sense of *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*. He is followed by many modern commentators. Thus Alford¹ speaks of "the act of laying aside the form of God," and says again, "He emptied Himself of the *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*."

Hofmann (*Philippians*, 1875, p. 61),² says that "the conceptions *μορφῇ Θεοῦ* and *μορφῇ δούλου* mutually exclude one another."

Dr. Bruce (*Humiliation of Christ*, p. 28) writes: "This act of self-exinanition involved . . . an exchange, absolute or relative, of the form of God for the form of a servant."

Last, not least, Thomasius (*Christi Person u. Werk*, ii. 415) writes: "He emptied Himself of the *μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, as is shown by the antithesis *μορφῇ δούλου*."

In all such interpretations it is assumed:

(1) That the *μορφῇ Θεοῦ* is something separable from the *οὐσία* or *φύσις*, the *essence* or *nature* of God;

(2) That the *μορφῇ Θεοῦ* is either (a) equivalent to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, (b) or that the latter phrase expresses "the internal nature," and the *μορφῇ* "the form of appearance" of Christ's deity.

I shall endeavour to show that each of these assumptions is erroneous.

(1) That *μορφῇ* is inseparable from *οὐσία* and *φύσις*, which can have no actual existence (*ἐνέργεια*) without *μορφῇ*, but only a potential existence (*δύναμις*); see pp. 171-176.

(2) That *μορφῇ Θεοῦ* and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ are (a) not equivalent, but in (b) their proper meanings are directly reversed.

If we can succeed in establishing these points, I believe that we shall have removed the chief sources of the extra-

¹ Note on v. 8.

² Note on v. 7.

ordinary confusion and uncertainty by which the interpretation of the passage has been obscured.

(1) *μορφή*. The late Bishop Lightfoot, in his admirable essay (*Philippians*, p. 127), has examined the use of the words *μορφή* and *σχῆμα* with a completeness which leaves little or nothing to be desired.

He has shown that while *σχῆμα* "denotes the figure, shape, fashion of a thing," and "altogether suggests the idea of something changeable, fleeting, unsubstantial," on the other hand, *μορφή*, even in its original meaning as applied to things visible, denotes the one *form* which is proper to the thing as such, and cannot change so long as the nature is the same. "The *μορφή* of a definite thing, as such, for instance, of a lion or a tree, is one only, while its *σχῆμα* may change every minute."

In passing to the higher philosophic sense of *μορφή*, Bishop Lightfoot quotes the passages of Plato, *Phædo*, pp. 103E, 104A, as showing that "in Plato's language the *μορφή* is the impress of the 'idea' on the individual, or, in other words, the specific character."

"In Aristotle's system, as he recognises no eternal self-existent archetype distinct from the specific character exhibited in the individual, it follows as a matter of course that with him *εἶδος* and *μορφή* are identical." Now *εἶδος* may be defined as the "universal nature manifesting itself in different individuals."¹ *Μορφή* is therefore the nature or essence, not in the abstract, but as actually subsisting in the individual, and retained as long as the individual itself exists.

Thus in the passage before us *μορφή Θεοῦ* is the Divine nature actually and inseparably subsisting in the Person of Christ.

This identity of *εἶδος* and *μορφή* may be illustrated by the

¹ Sir A. Grant, *Aristot. Nic. Eth.*, I. vi. 10.

language of Plotinus, *Ennead.*, IV., lib. vii., p. 457A, B: *εἰ μὲν οὐσίαν φήσουσι τὸ εἶδος τοῦτο εἶναι . . . οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἡ ὕλη ἐαυτὴν μορφοῖ.* Cf. Aristot., *De Anima*, I. iii. 26: *δοκεῖ γὰρ ἕκαστον ἴδιον ἔχειν εἶδος καὶ μορφήν.* If any distinction is to be drawn between the two words, *εἶδος* is the abstract, of which *μορφή* is the concrete realisation, or *τὸ ἐν ὕλῃ εἶδος* (Plotinus, 463B).

It is important to remember that this sense of *μορφή* was familiar to the contemporaries of St. Paul, as is proved by the passages quoted by Bishop Lightfoot from Plutarch and Philo Judæus.

The former, in describing Plato's doctrine of the genesis of the soul (*Moral.*, p. 1013c), writes thus: "For this world itself and each of its parts consists of a corporeal and a metaphysical (*νοητῆς*) essence, of which the one supplied the matter and substratum, and the other the form and specific character (*μορφήν καὶ εἶδος*) to the thing produced."

Again, in p. 1022E, where some preceding words have been lost, there remain the following: *κατὰ . . . τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχων ὡς μορφή καὶ εἶδος.*

Philo Judæus (*de Vict. Off.*, otherwise *de Sacrificantibus*, § 13, p. 261M): "That which has been mutilated is robbed of its quality and specific character (*τὴν ποιότητα καὶ τὸ εἶδος*), and is nothing else, properly speaking, than formless matter (*ἄμορφος ὕλη*)."

In the history of our English Bible we may find some reason to believe that the translators of A.D. 1611 consciously used the word "form" in this philosophical sense. Thus Wyclif wrote: "in the fourme of God," and "taking the fourme of a servaunt."

This was altered much for the worse by Tyndale (A.D. 1534) into "the shape of God," and "the shape of a servaunte," and so it remained in Cranmer's Bible (A.D. 1539), and the Geneva (A.D. 1557). But in the Rheims Bible (A.D.

1582) the word "forme" was restored in both places, and this was adopted in the Authorised Version (A.D. 1611).

It may possibly be asked what reason we have to think that the translators of A.D. 1611 were familiar with the philosophical sense of the word "*form*." On this point we have excellent testimony.

The first edition of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* was published in 1594. In Book I. c. iii. § 4 he speaks of "those forms which give them (things natural) their being"; and he adds in a note: "Form in other creatures is a thing proportionable unto the soul in living creatures. Sensible it is not, nor otherwise discernible than only by effects. According to the diversity of inward forms, things of the world are distinguished unto their kinds."

In 1620 Bacon's *Novum Organon* was published, and in Book II. Aphorism iv. he gives a definition of form remarkably pertinent to our present inquiry. "The form of a nature is such, that given the form the nature infallibly follows. Therefore it is always present, when the nature is present, and universally implies it, and is constantly inherent in it. Again the form is such, that if it be taken away the nature infallibly vanishes. Therefore it is always absent when the nature is absent, and implies its absence, and inheres in nothing else."

In Aphorism ii., speaking of the word *forms*, he says, "a name which I the rather adopt because it has grown into use and become familiar."

Thus it is clear that the philosophical sense of "form" was as familiar to our translators as that of *μορφή* to contemporaries of St. Paul.

If this is the true meaning of *μορφή* when used in its philosophical sense, to say that *μορφή* is separable from *φύσις* and *οὐσία*, and that "they can exist without it," is as manifest an error as to say that the abstract can exist

without any concrete, the universal without any individual, goodness without any good thing, the "nature" or "essence" of God without any God.

But since this error has been countenanced by some very able writers,¹ it may be well to trace it to its source.

Zanchius, a Protestant Professor of Divinity at Strassburg (1553), and at Heidelberg (1568), in his elaborate and learned *Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*, and again in his treatise *De Incarnatione Filii Dei*, adopted from his contemporary Danæus, or Lambert Daneau,² a peculiar definition of *μορφή*, differing from that which is derived, as we have seen, from its use by Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and Philo Judæus.

Zanchi writes that :

"*Οὐσία* properly signifies the bare essence, which is usually expressed by the definition made up of *genus* and *difference*, by which (according to Aristotle's doctrine) the *τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι* is declared : *e.g.*, the *οὐσία* of man is to be an animal endowed with reason. For this is the proper definition of man, whereby it is declared what he is.

"*Φύσις*, *i.e.* Nature, adds to the mere essence the essential and natural properties, as in man these are the capacity for learning, capacity also for knowledge, immortality (in the soul) risibility, speech, for these we say are natural to man, and his natural properties."

"*Μορφή* adds to the essence and to the essential and natural properties other accidentals, which follow the true nature of the thing, and by which, as it were by lineaments and colours, *οὐσία* and *φύσις* are fashioned and depicted, as in man to have the face turned up towards heaven, from which he is also called *ἄνθρωπος*, and as also the being endowed with such or such a form of body and limbs, etc."

¹ See above, p. 170.

² I have not been able to consult the work of Daneau, which is very rare, and not mentioned in the Bodleian Catalogue.

On these definitions we may remark that οὐσία, φύσις, and μορφή are properly metaphysical terms, not logical; and Zanchi's attempt to find equivalents for them in terms of the Aristotelian Logic involves much error and confusion.

Of the four meanings which Aristotle assigns to οὐσία (*Metaph.*, vi. 3. 1), three—the Universal, the Genus, and the Substratum—are mere abstractions. The fourth, τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι, which Zanchi, so far rightly, identifies with οὐσία, implies individual existence,¹ and is thus identified with μορφή.

In Aristotle, says Bishop Lightfoot,² “the form” (which is the aggregate of the qualities) “he calls indifferently εἶδος or μορφή. He moreover designates it by various synonyms. It is sometimes ‘the abstract conception realised’ (τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι), sometimes ‘the essence corresponding to the definition’ (ἡ οὐσία ἡ κατὰ τὸν λόγον), sometimes ‘the definition of the essence’ (ὁ λόγος τῆς οὐσίας), sometimes ‘the definition’ alone, sometimes ‘the essence’ alone.”

Every one of these designations shows that οὐσία, as defined by Zanchi, is included in the ‘form’ (μορφή) and inseparable from it.

Φύσις is not a logical term, and its definition by Zanchi, as “adding to the mere essence the essential and natural properties,” is entirely arbitrary, and inconsistent with the use of the word by Aristotle.

In *Metaph.*, iv. 1. 3, he classes it as a first principle (ἀρχή) with thought, and will, and essence, and the final cause; and in iv. 4. 8 he says that “nature properly so called is the essence of things which have their efficient cause in themselves, by reason of what they are.”³

¹ Sir A. Grant, *Ethics of Aristot.*, I., p. 502.

² *Philippians*, p. 126.

³ Cf. Sir A. Grant, *Eth. Nic.*, ii. 1. 2, n 3.

In iv. 4. 6 he says that natural productions, "though their substratum (or material) already exists, are not yet said to be in possession of their φύσις, unless they have their εἶδος and their μορφή." This is entirely inconsistent with Zanchi's definition, in which μορφή is no part of φύσις.

In the definition of μορφή itself Zanchi contradicts first Aristotle and then himself.

For first he limits the "form" to "accidents," which are in fact no part of the "form," since they are not of the essence,¹ but belong to the individual only.

Zanchi then concludes his account of μορφή by directly contradicting all that he has just before said.

"Thus μορφή," he adds, "embraces in itself both φύσις and οὐσία; and is nothing else than the essence itself clothed with all its properties."

This conclusion is in itself so true, that we can only wonder how the author could arrive at it through the preceding mass of confusion and errors.

For the interpretation of "*the form of God*" it is sufficient to say that (1) it includes the whole nature and essence of Deity, and is inseparable from them, since they could have no actual existence without it; and (2) that it does not include in itself anything "accidental" or separable, such as particular modes of manifestation, or conditions of glory and majesty, which may at one time be attached to the "form," at another separated from it. (3) The Son of God could not possibly divest Himself of "the form of God" at His Incarnation without thereby ceasing to be God: so that in all interpretations which assume that "the form of God" was laid aside when "the form of a servant" was assumed, it is, in fact, however unintentionally and unconsciously, denied that Jesus Christ during His life on earth was really and truly God.

¹ Arist., *Metaph.*, iv. 30. 4: ὅσα ὑπάρχει ἐκείστω καθ' αὐτὸ μὴ ἐν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ὄντα.

Of what then did He empty Himself at His Incarnation? The answer is contained in the next clause, the consideration of which must, however, be reserved for a future number of THE EXPOSITOR.

E. H. GIFFORD.

THE CULTUS OF FATHER ABRAHAM.

THAT any such cultus was ever developed among the Jews in the way of external observances is without proof, and is in itself improbable. No disposition seems to have existed among them to pay any excessive honours to the departed heroes of their race. They did, indeed, build the tombs of the prophets in our Lord's time—and that, no doubt, on the (real or reputed) sites of their decease or martyrdom. But there is no evidence that they went further. It is not even known that they resorted to these tombs for purposes of prayer, as the present inhabitants of the land (whether Moslem or Christian) habitually do. The sternness of the Old Testament monotheism and the horror of anything which savoured of heathenism no doubt suppressed any outward manifestations. But for all that, I believe there was a very real cultus of Father Abraham in the popular Judaism of our Lord's time. Men had learned to put their trust in Father Abraham for religious protection, relying for his good offices upon their relationship to him, and relying for the efficacy of those good offices upon his relationship to God. *They* were his children, identified with him as his seed both by parental affection and by God's sure word of promise. *He* was the Friend of God, whose intercession could not but command a gracious answer. That it was really so, we have (as it seems to me) sufficiently clear evidence in the Gospels.

It is not necessary to dwell upon such passages as

Matthew iii. 9; John viii. 33, 39, 53, in order to show that the Jews cherished with much self-complacency the fact of their physical descent from Abraham. They relied upon that fact in a way which made them comparatively indifferent to better grounds of religious confidence. This is obvious; and it is abundantly borne out by the sayings of St. Paul, both about himself and about his fellow-countrymen. What I want to establish goes farther than this. I believe that the ordinary Jew of our Lord's time had come to recognise Father Abraham more or less definitely as the patron and protector of his future life in such a way as practically to exclude the thought of God, the righteous Judge, who shall give unto every man according to his works. It was, indeed, when we come to think of it, almost inevitable that a religious confidence in descent from Abraham *should* assume this form as soon as the doctrine of a future life had developed itself and taken definite shape among the mass of the people. It was conceded that having Abraham for their father was an unspeakable privilege. It was, indeed, the one great boast of the Jew, his patent of religious nobility in the world. In this world, however, it stood him in little stead; and the whole trend of history had for long time been forcing his religious faith and hope into that unseen world which to David and the psalmists, and to Hezekiah too, had been so gloomy and so cheerless. Beyond the dark portals the Kingdom of Heaven opened to him now its visionary glories, and then he saw the faithful of Israel continually arriving and sitting down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at an endless feast of good things. That the language used, that the ideas cherished, concerning these good things, were frankly materialistic goes without saying. Nor is the fact in itself deplorable, because it is inevitable. People must not only speak of religion in the vocabulary, they must also think of religion in the ideas and associations, which they actu-

ally possess. Our Lord Himself, as we know, did not disdain to use the same frankly materialistic (and from our point of view very unworthy and inadequate) vocabulary when He talked about the future state to the men of His day.

In this better world, then, the prospect of which cheered the heart of the Jew under the discouragements of this world, Father Abraham presided over the joys of the faithful. Isaac and Jacob were there too, of course; but they were subordinate personages, as in the sacred writings. The one, indeed, was but a pale copy of his father, without distinctive character or merit. The other was remarkable enough, but only satisfactory in that he won and kept the precious birthright which made him at once inheritor and transmitter of the great promise, the promise made to Father Abraham. Practically, I take it, Father Abraham was supreme, and the others were negligible quantities. Father Abraham, sitting for ever at the head of the feast, was very much alive. None of his descendants, numerous though they were, was forgotten. One by one, as they passed from earth, they were distinguished, were received, were welcomed, were made at home by the father of the faithful, the friend of God; one by one he took them to his bosom. What made this view of things the more popular was no doubt its democratic character. On earth, the poorer kind of Jew was kicked and cuffed by uncircumcised heathen; he was also pillaged and despised by wealthy Israelites. Father Abraham would not make any difference: they were equally *his* children, equally possessed of the one patent of everlasting nobility, the one passport to the favours of heaven. It will not be forgotten that our Lord Himself recognised for certain purposes this democratic aspect of Judaism, within its own limits. He did this while continually protesting against its exclusiveness as regarded the rest of the world. "This woman being a

daughter of Abraham," ought to be delivered from the thralldom of the adversary even on the Sabbath; for surely religious privileges common to all the children of Abraham were never meant to be forfeited or suspended on the Sabbath! Zacchæus, too, "forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham," in spite of the deserved unpopularity of his business, is not to be excluded from the favour of Him who came as a minister of the circumcision. One can hardly doubt that in both these cases our Lord put forward not His own deepest reason for acting as He did, but the reason which was most fit for His critics then and there. For Himself, whilst He loyally respected the limits imposed upon His present mission, He cared nothing for the distinction between Israel and non-Israel. Both Zacchæus and the cripple-woman were above all things to Him children of the Heavenly Father, not children of Abraham. But since His Jewish critics recognised only the latter fact, let them at least be consistent. Thus on these occasions He vouchsafed to turn to good account that very pride of descent from Abraham, which made the Jews so exclusive against outsiders. They might at least (He intimated) be frankly *inclusive* within their own limits.

With these popular views about Abraham as the patron of Jews in the world to come, we must surely closely associate the expression "Abraham's bosom." Christian writers have taken it, curiously enough, as a mere synonym for "Paradise" or the seat of the happy dead before the resurrection. No doubt if you insist on reducing all these popular phrases of the future state to a dogmatic propriety and regularity, "Abraham's bosom" may be ordered into line with Paradise and other place-names of the kind. But it is much better to treat them separately and historically according to the popular ideas out of which they sprang. If you think of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and then of the Last Supper, you perceive at once

what "Abraham's bosom" means. Lazarus is Abraham's dear child. He is the last that has come home, and he has had a very bad time of it. All the same—nay, all the more—he shall lie on his father's breast, as his father's favourite whom he delighteth to honour. Had he been a famous Rabbi, or a successful merchant, he could not possibly have fared better. "Abraham's bosom" was the place of honour (for the time being) at the celestial supper. To understand it one has only to remember how the disciple whom Jesus loved lay on His breast at the supper, and looked up in his Master's face and asked, "Who is it, Lord?" The phrase embodied the comfortable assurance—not, of course, that all Jews would be located at once in the capacious lap of Father Abraham, according to certain absurd mediæval pictures—but that each, as he passed into the unseen, would have his equal turn of welcome and of cherishing. There is a whole world both of social custom and of religious thought gathered up in the phrase "Abraham's bosom." The custom and the thought are alike perished; but one must recall them and make them live again, if one would use the phrase with any intelligence.

It will of course be seen that I take the well-known parable of Dives and Lazarus as more than any other passage letting us into the secret of the popular belief of the Jews concerning Father Abraham and his place in the other world. That it speaks entirely in the language of the Jews, and moves wholly in the circuit of their thoughts, is to me absolutely certain. Christian writers and preachers, indeed, have not ceased to attempt to draw from it some information about the conditions of the future life. It is enough to say that they have been hopelessly baffled. Nothing Christian can be made out of it for the simple reason that there is nothing Christian in it. There is no Saviour, no repentance, no forgiveness, no God even. Father Abraham is the divinity of the piece. Nothing

looks higher than to him. He cannot possibly represent the Father of our souls as does the father in the parable of the Prodigal Son: rather he is the substitute for Him. The language, the scenery, the whole form of the parable, is not Christian, but Jewish—and Jewish, not of the psalmists and prophets, but of the degenerate and superstitious teachers who misled the people in our Lord's time. If one had to take this parable as expressing the mind of Christ, one would have to admit that He fell below the level which was reached by not a few of those who in days of old had found refuge from the tormenting obscurity of the future in the love and strength of God.

The explanation of this singular fact, and its abundant justification, lies in this, that our Lord chose in this parable to turn the popular religious belief and religious language of the Jews against their own errors and superstitions. Doubtless the teachers of His day told stories exactly like this in form—and, indeed, stories very similar in character might easily be quoted from the pulpits of Italy or of Spain to-day. By the aid of a lively imagination, and an unhesitating confidence of statement about things unseen, it is so easy to impress upon ignorant hearers the enormous advantages of certain religious privileges or practices or precautions which you wish to recommend. Just as St. Paul (in Gal. iv.) met the Judaizers who delighted in allegorical renderings of "the Law" with an allegory which was better than any of theirs, and cut exactly the other way; so our Lord told a story of the unseen in the language of popular religion, which conveyed the most tremendous and unmistakable warnings against popular superstitions. If it be objected that our Lord cannot be thought to have spoken anything but the language of absolute truth, one can but answer that in that case one must give up the attempt to understand His teaching. He was not surely so timid Himself. The

splendid boldness with which He clothed His doctrine in any figures of speech, in any kind of utterance, which might serve to bring it home to the hearts and minds of His hearers is one of the very things which so profoundly convince us that He spake as never man spake. Unlike ourselves, He was infinitely more concerned that His teaching should be positively true than that it should be negatively harmless. Apparently He never hesitated to lay Himself open to any amount of misconstruction if only He might drive home some saving truth, or some needful warning, in such a way that it should stick.

The parable stands in Luke xvi. without a word of introduction. It will probably suggest itself at once that by some accident of transcription vv. 16-18 (which seem quite irrelevant here) have displaced some other words which served to introduce the parable. But there is no use in setting up a guess of that kind for which there is no evidence. If we fall back, in the absence of any other clue, upon the first part of the chapter and especially upon vv. 14, 15, we get the following situation. Our Lord had dwelt in His teaching upon two great ideas as to which the Pharisees found themselves totally opposed to His views. One was money; the other was God. To our Lord money appeared not as a good thing in itself, but as a trial and responsibility which prudence and piety might convert into a means of great and lasting good. To the Pharisees money appeared an eminently desirable thing, the possession of which enabled them to secure numberless enjoyments and immunities. To our Lord, God appeared as the supreme Ruler and Judge by whom actions and motives are weighed, who will take account of the use which every man has made of His gifts. To the Pharisees, God appeared practically as One far above out of sight, who might almost be left out of account. Father Abraham would take care of their eternal interests, so that they might

enjoy their riches without disagreeable anticipations of another world. Everybody knew how kindly he had interceded, even upon earth, for those uncircumcised sinners in the cities of the plain. They knew too how graciously God had listened to his intercessions, and had five times reduced the number of the righteous who should be the saving of Sodom if found therein. How much more, when Abraham was promoted to preside over those heavenly regions, would he intercede for his own children! and how much more graciously would he be heard! Surely no child of Abraham could fail to be gathered to his bosom, except he had played the apostate and forfeited his portion in Israel! The Friend of God might be trusted to see to the spiritual interests of his own flesh and blood. So the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, but were also pledged to a belief in another life, sneered at Him. Then He told them this story. It was about a man who—like themselves when fortune favoured—had plenty of money and used it selfishly. It was about Father Abraham in whom they trusted. He told the story in the language of the hardest realism. There is no attempt to distinguish between the conditions of this life and of that. The details of the disembodied state are crudely impossible. There is no attempt to introduce any moral or spiritual considerations, except those negative ones: money isn't of any use in that world, and Father Abraham isn't of any use either. He looks on cold, immovable, totally unable to assist his unhappy "son" in the least. He can only play the disagreeable and unwelcome part of an external conscience. If I am right, Lazarus is introduced merely as a foil to the rich man's misery. Here he had been supremely wretched; there he lies on Abraham's breast as the last wanderer come home, as the favourite of the hour. But his being there is absolutely without moral significance, because he is not represented as having been virtuous or devout, and

because to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was only what every Jew expected to do. The unexpected thing, and the truly awful thing, was that money selfishly used involved a frightful retribution, and that Father Abraham could do nothing at all. So then one may find the climax of this story in that pitiful cry, "Father Abraham, have mercy upon me." It is really pitiful because it is the one instance in Scripture of the invocation of saints, and because it stands undistinguished in error and in uselessness from a million other cries which go up from terror-stricken souls in their anguish. Is it possible to think that our Lord invented this terrible cry? Is it not morally certain that He took it, if not from the lips, at any rate from the hearts, of His hearers? Doubly wrong, and twice deceived, they trusted, in this world, not to goodness and courage, but to money; in that world, not to God, but to Father Abraham. They had made lies their refuge, and under falsehood hid themselves; but as our Lord drew for them this picture, so hard, so inexorable, the hail swept away their refuge of lies and the waters overflowed their hiding place.

I am bound to say that the latter part of the parable (*vv.* 27-31) is not altogether of the character for which I have argued. It also is negative: it is intended to shatter a vain hope; but the hope, the prayer, which it coldly puts aside, is not evil or selfish. It seems to me to have been added, sorrowfully, in response to very different thoughts from those of the purse-proud or of the superstitious. It is a not infrequent feature of our Lord's parables that He added something to what one may call the original design of the parable. Sometimes the addition appears incongruous, and, from a literary point of view, weakens the effect. So it is here. But that only means that He, who was the best judge of the need, thought it worth while to sacrifice a little of the effectiveness in order to add more

to the usefulness of the story which He told. As it is, that story stands unrivalled, even among our Lord's discourses, for the extraordinary incisiveness with which it deals with certain popular untruths.—

RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM.

THE INTERCESSION OF THE SPIRIT.

“For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us ward. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.

“And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.”—ROMANS viii. 18-23, 26-27.

THESE verses cast an intense light on some of Paul's deepest thoughts concerning God, the universe and man. To those who had not yet received the Christian salvation he preached a simple gospel; and he preached simply to those whose religious life was as yet very imperfectly developed,—to persons whom he described as “carnal,” “babes in Christ”; but for those in whom the religious life had reached the maturity of manhood, he had teaching of a very different order. “We speak wisdom among the perfect—the full grown.”

In this passage he speaks with a majesty and daring that touch the very heights of sublimity concerning some of the greatest mysteries which can exercise human speculation; and if the substance of his teaching is lodged firmly in our thoughts, we shall be enriched with a divine wisdom

which will serve us well in the discipline of faith and the conduct of life.

I do not propose, of course, to illustrate the meaning of the whole passage: to do that would require many volumes filled from end to end with strenuous thinking: but I want to draw out, in a manner that shall be intelligible, one remarkable strand in the complicated structure of its teaching.

First, look at Paul's account of the visible creation—the heavens and the earth, the living creatures by which we are surrounded: he speaks of it as being under “the bondage of corruption,” and as “subjected to vanity,”—as waiting for some great deliverance that lies in the future. “We know,” he says, “that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.” There is suffering of which the universe is impatient, and which cannot last for ever; there is a longing for rest and for harmony; its powers are thwarted; its healthy growth is arrested; there is a grace, a beauty, a perfection unachieved. “The whole creation *groaneth*”—that is a strong and impressive word—“groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now”: it is a prolonged agony,—the agony of giving birth to a fairer and more glorious creation than itself.

And as for ourselves who “have the firstfruits” of the new and divine order, we have not yet reached the peace and the power and the joy to which God has destined us. Is there not the strangest and most pathetic contrast between the greatness of our titles and the misery of our condition? We are sons of God—and yet how little of the divine glory rests upon us! we are heirs to immortal blessedness—but how frail we are! how helpless! how keen are our sorrows! how faint and how transitory our joys! “Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption,”—by which in this place Paul means “the redemption of the body”; or perhaps he may mean that

our complete adoption cannot come till "the redemption of the body." The great redeeming forces have begun to work; the powers of a divine life are within us; but while we remain in the flesh, and while we are living in this troubled world which is our home,—as long as we remain in the flesh, even the redemption of Christ is very far from complete. Till the body is transfigured and made the fitting organ of the life of the spirit, we are maimed and halt, our vision is dim, our hearing dull. Paul will yield to no illusions. He will see things exactly as they are. We *groan* within ourselves—as Christians—waiting for the redemption of the body. You are to expect nothing different from this while you remain here. You are to find consolation and courage in hope of the glory that is coming.

But this is not all: "the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered."

Is not that wonderful? Is it not startling? The creation is groaning—suffering—longing for a perfection it has not reached, for a rest and freedom from pain which as yet it cannot know. We Christian men are groaning; our condition is hard; our sufferings at times are great; the full and harmonious perfection we long for is out of reach. We are not free to work out our better conceptions of life and conduct: we are heavily burdened by the flesh. And the Spirit, the Spirit of God, who is making intercession for us—the Spirit shares the trouble—makes intercession "with groanings which cannot be uttered." For Him, too, there are unfulfilled and baffled purposes. He is hindered; He cannot work out His gracious will. He suffers pain; He is thwarted; He struggles against restraints which prevent Him from achieving His will. He makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.

To the vivid imagination of Paul, the creation is a living

thing; and it groans while travailing in birth with a diviner universe. To the knowledge and experience of Paul, those who are already in Christ groan under the burdens and hindrances which at times prevent them from reaching the perfect life. To the faith of Paul, God Himself, in the person of the Spirit of God, is groaning in His great but thwarted endeavours to secure for us the power and the peace and the perfection which are our inheritance in Christ. He groans under the limitations imposed upon Him, partly by the necessities of our conditions, partly by our unfaithfulness.

That seems to me a very remarkable line of thought. It will reward meditation; it illustrates the Christian conception of the universe, of man, and of God.

There has been a very general reluctance on the part of expositors of this Epistle to take Paul's words as they stand. They have not been able to rise to the heights of his thought. The "intercession" has been attributed to the Spirit of God, Who is represented as moving and inclining us to pray; but "the groanings which cannot be uttered" have been attributed to *us*—not to Him; Paul has been made to mean that *we* groan in the earnestness of our longing for the great blessings which the Spirit inclines us to pray for. This is not what Paul said—it is not what Paul meant; and this meaning has been imposed upon him because a conception of God has prevailed in the Christian Church, drawn not from the historic revelation of God to the Jewish nation and in Christ, but from metaphysical philosophy,—a conception of God which represents Him as living in an eternal and passionless calm, as incapable of what can be called conflict or grief.

Great and wonderful is the life of the Eternal, and it lies beyond the comprehension of human thought; but it is a life to which in inferior forms our own life corresponds; and the daring language of Jewish prophets and of Christian

apostles who attribute to God anger and sorrow and a change of mind resulting from the conduct of His creatures, is far truer and profounder—is nearer the fact—than the cold and colourless account of Him which is given by Deistic speculations. To make the groanings which cannot be uttered ours—not His—is to do violence to Paul's language, and to destroy the energy of his thought.

What Paul says in substance is that the Spirit of God who lives and works in Christian men has an immense longing for their perfection,—a perfection which as yet they have not reached; that He feels—that He Himself feels—the burden of their troubles, their failures, their limitations; that in Him—though in a divine form—there is what in ourselves we call the pain and yearning of an unfulfilled hope; in us, that pain and yearning find utterance in groans; in Him, they lie too deep in His mysterious and infinite life for utterance—they are “groanings which cannot be uttered.”

Consider the intimacy of the relationship between the Spirit of God and ourselves which this implies. I suppose that to very many of us the Spirit seems nothing more than a divine power which from time to time is exerted on us from without. We think of Him as a divine wind which moves and freshens the sultry and stagnant air of our higher life; as the rain and the dew which descend upon the withering, fainting grass to renew its healthy and vigorous growth. Or we think of the Spirit as an illumination granted to us for some happy hours,—like occasional sunlight on cloudy days—days followed by dark and dreary nights, in which His splendour is wholly concealed. While the illumination lasts, we see wonderful things, and our hearts are filled with warmth and joy. Or we think of the Spirit as approaching us like a friend to warn us in times of peril, to comfort us in times of sorrow, to animate us with courage and earnestness by disclosing to us noble

truths. These conceptions are true as far as they go, but they are imperfect. They are Jewish rather than Christian. The whole impression of the New Testament teaching is that He is immanent in the life of the Church and of the individual Christian. He makes His abode with us, not as a stranger, or even as a friend, who stays with us for a time, but does not share the sorrows and joys, the successes and the troubles, of the house, but as one of the family; our fortunes are His. The work which He is accomplishing in us is like the picture which the artist is painting on the canvas: He is trying to give expression and reality to a fair and noble conception of His own, and to express His own thought and life in ours. He has present to His mind the perfection for which He is working. He finds joy in His work, but His work is not all joy; for in this case the canvas is a living man, and the colours are the affections and volitions and habits of a living man; the materials of His art are not, therefore, perfectly submissive to His will: they are wayward and inconstant; He groans because He is hindered and thwarted.

The words suggest the depth and strength of His love for us. He is troubled because we are not yet what we are destined to be. As a mother groans because her child has many faults, and because its very virtues are imperfect; as in the greatness of her love she cares more—is not it so?—for her child's goodness than her own; so the Spirit cares, and cares supremely, for our righteousness and joy.

Do we sufficiently remember and adequately realize this love of the Spirit? We might have learnt it from our Lord's own words about the expediency of His departure in order that the Spirit might come to His disciples. It was the depth and tenderness of His love for His friends that made the loss of His visible presence so keen a pain. If that other Comforter of whom He spoke had not had equal love, His presence would not have been a compensation for

that supreme loss. The Spirit might have brought larger knowledge, made possible a nobler righteousness, given to the Church higher forms of power; but if His love for us had been less than the love of Christ, we should still have been unconsoled. It is one of the most serious evils accompanying the common conception of the Spirit as an influence, rather than a Person, that the strength and happiness which come from the full assurance of His love for us are unknown.

“He maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.” *Intercession?* Why? What need is there for intercession? Cannot He—the Eternal Spirit—confer upon us at will all the blessings of salvation?

Ah! no. According to the divine order—the necessary relations between us and God—there must be movement from the side of man to God, if there is to be continuous movement from the side of God to man. The movement begins on God’s side, but it will be arrested unless it is taken up and continued on ours. And so—while the divine mercy is the original fountain of our salvation—the Eternal Son of God became man that He might bear the sin of the world, and die, the Righteous for the unrighteous. The divine grace yearning to forgive us had to be met by the propitiation for the sin of the world, if forgiveness was to be actually conferred.

And so, now that the Atonement has been offered and the divine grace is yearning to make us perfect in righteousness and blessedness, that grace has still to be met by prayer and supplication on our side, if the righteousness and blessedness are to be actually achieved. We pray; but are conscious that “we know not how to pray as we ought,” and the Spirit within us takes up the work of intercession. He, like Christ, is our Advocate with the Father, in whom are represented all the majesty, and sovereignty, and righteousness, and love, and power of the Eternal.

He has made His home in the innermost sanctuary of our life—in its Holy of Holies ; and we are temples of the Holy Spirit : from that inner sanctuary His intercession on our behalf ascends to Heaven ; it is His, and He makes it with groanings which cannot be uttered. We, dimly perceiving His meaning, desiring vaguely for ourselves the great blessings which He desires for us, say Amen to the prayers which we only imperfectly understand. But He who searches the hearts, and sees beneath all our poor human thought and desire the mind of the Spirit, answers—not our desires, but *His*. Yes, He maketh intercession for us according to the will of God. And as the Christian life matures, we, too, know the mind of the Spirit more and more clearly ; and with larger intelligence and intenser desire we make His prayers our own.

R. W. DALE.

CORNELIUS AND THE ITALIC COHORT.

THE reference in *Acts* x. 1 to an Italic cohort (of which Cornelius was a centurion) has caused some difficulty and discussion in recent years. Dr. Schürer, in his learned work, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes u. s. w.*, I. p. 386, suspects that this detail is an anachronism, caused by the intrusion of circumstances that were true at a later time into this early period.¹ Prof. Mommsen pronounces no judgment, but avoids making any positive suggestion about the cohort, in his illuminative paper in the *Berlin. Akad. Sitzungsber.*, 1895, p. 503.² Marquardt, in the work from which all study must always begin in these subjects, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, II. p. 467, note 5, accepts the words of *Acts* as an ordinary authority, quoting them along with other references to an Italic cohort. A recent discovery confirms the position taken by Marquardt, and will probably be held by most scholars as a sufficient proof that, in our present state of knowledge, the verdict of Dr. Schürer is contrary to the evidence.

Dr. Bormann, in the *Archäol. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich*, 1895, p. 218, publishes an inscription found recently at Carnuntum.³ It is the epitaph of a young soldier, Proculus, a subordinate officer (*optio*) in the second Italian cohort, who died at Carnuntum while engaged on detached service from the Syrian army (as an officer in a corps of archers from Syria, temporarily sent on special service and encamped at Carnuntum).⁴ Proculus was born at Phila-

¹ Steht . . . unter dem Verdacht, Verhältnisse einer späteren Zeit in eine frühere zurück verlegt zu haben.

² Mit sicherheit vermögen wir weder diese cohors Augusta noch die σπειρα Ἰταλική . . . zu identificiren.

³ One of the great military stations in Pannonia, on the south bank of the Danube, a little below Vienna.

⁴ *Ex vexil. sagit. exer. Syriaci*, where Bormann's completion of the abbreviations seems beyond question *ex vexillariis sagittariis exercitus Syriaci*.

delphia (doubtless the city of that name beyond Jordan, the old Rabbath-Ammon), and his father bore the Syrian name Rabilus.

As to the date of this epitaph, Bormann and Domaszewski, two of the highest authorities, have come independently to the same conclusion. The epitaph was found with a group of others, stamped by criteria derived both from nomenclature, and from inscriptional and alphabetical character, as belonging to the period of the early emperors. This group belongs to an older cemetery used previous to A.D. 73, when a new camp near Carnuntum was built for the soldiers stationed there. Further, the service on which these Syrian soldiers had come to Carnuntum can be dated with the highest probability.

In A.D. 96 Syrian detachments to the number of 13,000 men swelled the army which Mucianus, governor of Syria, led westwards to support Vespasian in his struggle against Vitellius. But before Mucianus arrived on the scene, the armies of Pannonia and Moesia had declared for Vespasian, marched into Italy, and finished the contest. Their departure had left the northern frontier undefended against the barbarians, Dacians, Germans, etc., beyond the Danube. As Tacitus mentions, the Dacians showed signs of invading Moesia, and Mucianus despatched the Sixth Legion¹ to guard against them on the Lower Danube. Tacitus does not say anything about the Upper Danube; but there was so obvious a danger there also, that an experienced governor like Mucianus could hardly fail to send a guard thither also.² In this way we may conclude that part of the detachments came to Carnuntum; and there Proculus died, perhaps in A.D. 70. The Syrian armies were evidently soon sent back to the East, where the Sixth Legion is

¹ Ferrata, enrolled by Augustus, stationed in Syria, now in Mucianus's army.

² The words of Tacitus (*Hist.*, iii. 46) show that he was fully alive to the danger all along the northern frontier.

shortly afterwards mentioned as engaged in operations in the northern parts of Syria in 73.

There was therefore an Italic cohort stationed in Syria in A.D. 69. It was recruited from the East,¹ and therefore, according to the principle laid down by Mommsen, it belonged to the eastern Roman armies; it is therefore in every way probable that an Italic cohort was stationed in the province Syria, as Dr. Bormann has observed, about A.D. 40, when Cornelius is mentioned as "a centurion of the cohort called Italic," resident in Cæsarea (the Roman governmental centre of Palestine). The new discovery does not prove anything with certainty for the period about A.D. 40; but, taken along with *Acts*, it enables us to fill in some details in a way that is in perfect accordance with our knowledge of Roman military organization.

But Dr. Schürer brings forward a series of objections. He points out, in the first place, that between A.D. 41 and 44, when Judæa was formed into a dependent kingdom ruled by Herod Agrippa, a Roman cohort would not be stationed in Cæsarea. If this were certain, it would merely confirm the view taken by many scholars that the incident of Cornelius occurred earlier than 41. But as a matter of fact we know far too little of the relations between the rule of Agrippa and the provincial administration to be sure that a centurion would not be resident in Cæsarea during his short reign. There is nothing more obscure than the precise terms on which the numerous dependent kingdoms in Asia Minor and Syria were administered. It is practically certain that these subject kingdoms were tributary² from the first, even when they had never before been subject to Rome; and Herod the Great's action was controlled

¹ Proculus was in his seventh year of service when he died, and had probably enlisted in A.D. 64 (when he was 19 years old).

² Appian expressly says that Herod's kingdom was instituted (in 40 or 39 B.C.), along with Pontus and others, ἐπὶ φόβοις τεταγμένοις, *Bell. Civ.*, v. 75.

by Rome in many important respects, and that his subjects took an oath to be faithful to the Romans.¹ But the kingdom of Agrippa as it existed A.D. 41-44 had long been actually part of a Roman province; and there is great probability that it might retain certain relations with the provincial government, and that officers of the provincial soldiery might be kept resident in the capital, Cæsarea, to maintain these relations. There is much that might be said on this point; but it is not necessary for our main purpose. Moreover, the whole subject is so obscure that a scholar who aims simply at understanding the subject will at present refrain from any dogmatic statement about it, and will certainly be very slow to condemn an ancient author for inaccuracy because he does not confirm the modern scholar's hasty conjecture. All that need be said is that at present we find Dr. Schürer's argument so devoid of force that it does not even afford any presumption in favour of a date for the incident of Cornelius earlier than 41 A.D.

In the next place Dr. Schürer argues that even between A.D. 6 and 41, when Judæa was part of the province Syria, and when Roman auxiliary troops were stationed both at Cæsarea and at Jerusalem, an Italic cohort cannot have been stationed at Cæsarea. This assertion he bases on a series of conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judæa during these years. It is fortunately unnecessary for me to discuss his conjectures: I need only point out (1) that they are in conscious and direct contradiction to the principles laid down by Mommsen; the supreme authority on the subject;² (2) that Mommsen has now considered them and judged them to be "erroneous in

¹ See the references as collected in the many treatises on the subject, *e.g.*, in Dr. Schürer's own work, ii., p. 440.

² See Mommsen in *Hermes*, xix. p. 217. As to one of his estimates of the probable facts, Dr. Schürer says that it is "unmöglich," giving a singularly insufficient reason for this plump condemnation.

every respect.”¹ But even supposing that his conjectures were strong enough to support the conclusion that the Italic cohort was not stationed in Cæsarea, we know far too little to justify the inference that a centurion of that cohort could not be on duty there. The entire subject of detachment service is most obscure; and we are very far from being able to say with certainty that the presence of an auxiliary centurion² in Cæsarea is impossible, unless the cohort in which he was an officer was stationed there.

Since the question of the Roman troops in Palestine is so full of difficulties, that it is hardly possible to make any assertion in the matter, what judgment should be pronounced on the light-heartedness which suspects Luke of inaccuracy, because he does not conform to the conjectures which the distinguished German professor sets forth? It is a matter of interest to observe how slow some very learned New Testament scholars are to appreciate the principle, which is regarded as fundamental by the historical and antiquarian students, that no conjecture which is not founded on clear evidence has any right even to be propounded, if it contradicts the direct statement of an ancient authority: much less ought the ancient authority to be discredited because he disagrees with a modern conjecture. It is specially unfortunate that Dr. Schürer should encumber his pages with such conjectures, for his deservedly high reputation and his immense erudition lead many scholars in England (and probably elsewhere) to take everything printed in his great work as the final statement of the truth.³

It may be remarked in passing that the question of the relation of the dependent kingdom of Judæa to the Roman

¹ *In jeder Hinsicht verfehlt*: Mommsen in *Berlin. Akad. Sitz.*, 1895, p. 501.

² Auxiliary centurions, being of lower rank than legionary, were not employed as *frumentarii*, but there were other ways of detached service

³ Dr. Schürer makes one correct statement on the subject: *directe Nachrichten fehlen uns*.

government which we have touched upon is connected with the great difficulty of the census in that kingdom, when Quirinus was governor of Syria (Luke iii. 1). As I regard that passage of Luke as the result of a careful and elaborate historical inquiry, made when abundant authorities were accessible, and therefore hold it to be trustworthy and one of the most illuminative passages in any ancient author bearing on my own special subject (the history of Roman administration in the eastern provinces), it is clear that I am bound to differ absolutely from Dr. Schürer's elaborate discussion of the subject (ii. pp. 426-455). Particularly his third conclusion, that such a census as Luke describes could not have been held in Judæa while Herod was king, seems to me to be an *exemplar* of erroneous reasoning and erroneous conception from first to last. Here and everywhere that Dr. Schürer touches on my own department of study, I find myself in opposition to his method of investigation. If he is right in regard to that fundamental question, it would be mere waste of time for me to insist on the accuracy of Luke in other and smaller questions, such as the one here treated; and therefore it is necessary here to declare (1) that the view taken by Luke of the relation between the dependent kingdoms and the Roman state is very different from that taken by Dr. Schürer; (2) that, when the investigation of that page of history is completed, Luke's view is likely to be established.¹

The episode of Cornelius in *Acts* is characterized by the same vagueness and want of direct, incisive statement of details which Luke shows in handling the early history of the Church in Palestine. He was not at home in the

¹ A distinction must be made between the fact (as I believe it to be) that such a census occurred, and the historical hypothesis advanced by Luke that the census brought about the effect that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. The hypothesis may be right or wrong; I see no evidence justifying an opinion on the point; but the hypothesis is founded on a careful historical survey, which shows all the signs of good knowledge and trustworthiness.

province of Syria, and the Jewish people in particular he neither understood nor liked. If the narrative of Cornelius showed the same mastery of facts and surroundings as is apparent in Philippi or Ephesus or Cyprus or Athens, we should find it far more instructive than it is as to the way in which an officer of the Roman army of occupation lived. Was he resident in a private house? How was he in such close relations with the Jews throughout Palestine? Many questions suggest themselves, pressing for an answer, which I cannot give. But the tendency of discovery distinctly is, in this as in other cases, to confirm the trustworthiness of the general situation.

I may use this opportunity to beg that a correction be made in my brief discussion of the episode of Cornelius in my *St. Paul*, p. 43, l. 1, by the insertion before "proselyte" of the word "God-fearing." In writing the book, I shrank from using the complete term before it had been defined; but it was wrong to leave the slightest room for misapprehension in regard to such a cardinal point. Some critics, who have touched on this point in reviewing my book, seem inclined to hold that Cornelius was not even a proselyte of the inferior class, and to think that the words "a devout man, and one that feared God" (x. 1) are used only in a vague and general sense, as if equivalent to "a man of naturally religious temperament." It is, however, contrary to the principles which I follow in the interpretation of *Acts* to take such an important term as "fearing God" in any but the strict sense. Moreover Luke was here undoubtedly dependent on Jewish informants, who would not speak of "fearing God" unless they meant the God of Israel. Finally, the other details in the record, that Cornelius gave much alms to the people (x. 2, obviously the Jews), that he prayed to God alway (x. 2), that he was well reported of by all the nation of the Jews (x. 22), that he fell at the feet of a Jew and did obeisance to him (x. 25), seem to me incon-

ceivable in the case of a Roman officer, unless he had come into relations with the synagogue and been impressed with its religious teaching and principles. I cannot doubt that Luke used the term "fearing God" in x. 1, x. 22, x. 35, in its full implication.

W. M. RAMSAY.

SONS OF GOD AND DAUGHTERS OF MEN.

"And it came to pass, that when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, that the sons of Elohim saw the daughters of Adam that they were fair; and they took them wives of all whom they chose. There were Nephelim¹ in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of Elohim came in unto the daughters of Adam, and they bare to them. The same were Gibborim² which were of old, men of renown."—GENESIS vi. 1, *et seq.*

THIS remarkable statement follows immediately after what may be called the new Adamic genealogy beginning in chapter v., after Abel has perished, and Cain has become a fugitive, so that it becomes necessary to the continuity of the history to begin the narrative of human descent anew in the line of Seth. It has naturally caused much discussion, and there are few expositors who seem to have very definite views respecting it, except those who regard the whole story as myth or allegory, and by whom it is placed on a level not with history, but with the amours of the Olympian gods in Greek mythology. Yet, in the view of the writer or editor of Genesis, it was evidently a historical event of much importance, as it is made the cause or occasion of that descent of the new Sethite line into evil which led to the Divine determination to destroy the children of men after a short probation of one hundred and twenty years.

¹ Giants, athletes, bullies, or men of violence.

² Heroes, or famous men in war and arts.

In articles on the early history of man published in the *EXPOSITOR* in 1894-95, I ventured, from the point of view of a naturalist, to give an explanation of this episode, bringing it, as I believed, into congruity with the structure of Genesis, and with what we know from other sources of the history of the primitive races of men. I have since had to answer many questions from Bible students as to this—to them new—suggestion, and have in consequence been obliged to study the subject more in detail, with results which have induced me to prepare a supplementary note on this curious question, which has much bearing on our views as to the antiquity and unity of Genesis, and also as to the use of different Divine names in different portions of it.

The current explanations of the passage may, I think, be reduced to three. (1) The sons of God were angelic beings entering into connubial relations with human maidens; and this, as the terms imply, not in the way of occasional intercourse but of actual marriage. (2) The sons of God were men of eminence and position forming matrimonial alliances with women of inferior rank. (3) They were Sethite men allying themselves with ungodly Cainite women.

The first of these explanations may be characterized as non-natural or miraculous in a bad sense; that is, as implying the action not of God, but of demons or evil angels assuming human forms. It is at variance with all the other statements of the Bible respecting angelic beings, and with our Lord's declaration that they neither marry nor are given in marriage. It has, I think, no serious advocates among educated men at present, except among those who regard the whole document in which it occurs as unhistorical. The second hypothesis appears to be trivial and insufficient to produce the effects assigned to the occurrence. The third is rational and natural, if we assume that the Cainite

race had long existed as a separate tribe from the Sethites; and it has a parallel in the subsequent history, in the inter-marriages of Israelites with Canaanite and other foreign women. It seems to be at present the theory most favoured by orthodox commentators.

All of these explanations, however, appear to me to fail in meeting the natural and historical requirements of the case; and more especially to be deficient in their importing into a primeval age conditions belonging to later periods, and in failing to recognise that archaic character of the Book of Genesis which is too much overlooked by most of its modern critics. If we take the terms of the record as relating to literal facts, and these facts as belonging to the ideas and doings of the most primitive times, we shall find that a very different interpretation may be given to them. It is on grounds of this kind that I have ventured to suggest that the sons of Elohim in our primitive record are really Cainites, and the daughters of Adam Sethite women, though I admit that at first sight, and without throwing ourselves back mentally into the beginnings of humanity, such a view may appear very improbable.

In the first chapter of Genesis the name of God is Elohim; in the second it becomes Jahveh-Elohim. The first use of the term Jahveh by human lips is, however, attributed to Eve when on the birth of Cain she says "I have gotten a man, the Jahveh," not "*from* Jahveh," as in our translation. The meaning of this exclamation of the first mother is plain from the immediately preceding statements. After the Fall a Saviour had been promised, who is to be the seed or progeny of the woman, and Eve most naturally supposes that the child to whom she has given birth is this "coming one." Like many interpreters of prophecy in later times, she antedates its fulfilment. From the time of this utterance of Eve we may assume that the name Jahveh becomes that of the coming Redeemer,

and is associated with that of Elohim, who has promised the Redeemer. Thus the name Elohim represents God as Creator; the name Jahveh, God as the promised Redeemer. The foundation is thus laid in our primitive record for that idea of a Redeemer or Mediator which pervades the whole Bible, and which under the corruptions of heathenism became multiplied into "gods many and lords many." The point, however, which we now note is that this distinction existed from the time of Eve, though only in the days of her grandson Enos did men formally invoke Jahveh as God.¹ This is the testimony of the record, and we are bound to receive it in that sense whether we believe it or not.

In Genesis iv. 3, Cain and Abel are represented as presenting offerings or gifts to Jahveh. Yet Cain's offering was rather one to God in the aspect of the God of nature, than as the promised Redeemer. The context implies that it was purposely so, and the subsequent "talking" or dispute with Abel may not improbably have referred to this. In any case it is Jahveh who remonstrates with Cain, and after the murder of Abel denounces his conduct, apparently without effect; and henceforth Cain may be said to have broken with Jahveh as the redeeming God, though he seems to be aware that as a murderer he may ultimately suffer from the vengeance of his fellow-men.

Cain is next said to have gone out from the face of Jahveh, which implies much more in the way of religious separation than mere departure from a local shrine; and at the same time he leaves his paternal home and goes forth to found a new tribe of men distinct from that of Adam. In a primitive state of society, when there are no prisons or penal colonies, a murderer must either be slain or banished from his tribe into the wilderness without; and this involves a social and religious excommuni-

¹ Chapter iv. 26.

cation and isolation, leading often in ancient times to the foundation of a new tribe and race.

Thus we have presented to us the formation of two distinct clans destined to diverge greatly from each other in a few generations. We have not obscure indications of this divergence even in the brief record of Genesis. In a religious point of view the Cainites are not represented as cultivating the worship of the Redeemer-Jahveh. They probably, however, still retained the nature-worship of Elohim, and so might be termed "sons of Elohim." They built cities and cultivated the arts of civilization, while some of them perpetuated the vagabondism of Cain by entering on a nomadic and probably hunting life, and falling into a rude and barbarous condition, in which their arts and implement-making were made subsidiary to aggressive warfare. Of the Sethites, on the other hand, we have mainly the record of their invoking Jahveh while walking with Elohim, and of their retaining a hope of a redemption from the Fall, though it seems certain that toward the end of the antediluvian period they also degenerated in a religious point of view, probably in consequence of the intermixture with Cainites mentioned in the passage before us. This intermixture, however, is stated to have originated in the aggressions of the nephelim among the Cainites, who captured wives from the feeblers Sethites. This, I think, is implied in the expression "took to them wives of all whom they chose," that is, at their own will and pleasure and without regard to the primitive law of marriage, which provided that a man should leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, implying friendly social relations with his wife's relatives.¹ The issue of such marriages would necessarily be Gibborim, or men of greater power and energy than either of the pure races, which would eventually be overcome and dominated

¹ Gen. ii. 24. See also our Lord's reference to this in Matt. xix. 5.

by them. Thus we have a natural explanation given to us of the violence and misrule which raged in the antediluvian world, and which threatened to quench all its higher moral and spiritual life.

But it may be asked : If the Cainites are called sons of Elohim, why are not the Sethites termed sons of Jahveh ? The answer is—(1) That if named in that way at all, they should be called sons of Jahveh-Elohim, because they worshipped God in both capacities. (2) That as Jahveh was a future Redeemer, they could scarcely be called His sons. (3) That they were *par excellence* sons of Adam, since Cain had been disinherited and banished ; and we learn in chapter fifth that a new genealogy was in consequence commenced in the line of Seth—a circumstance which the purely mechanical critics unreasonably represent as the beginning of a new and distinct document.

The Sethites were thus sons and daughters of Adam by special right, just as the Israelites were children of Abraham in a different sense from the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, and others, who had diverged from the ancestral faith. Besides this, it is well known that many ancient peoples have been in the habit of regarding themselves as men in the true sense as distinguished from other peoples. The distinctions of Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Egyptian and vile foreigner, are cases in point. In rude tribes in America the same feeling prevails. Hence the Chippewyans and Esquimaux in Northern America each claim for themselves exclusively the title of men, refusing it to each other.

Looking then at the narrative in Genesis as consisting of the annals of a very primitive time, we are led by its own terms to regard the sons of Elohim as Cainites, the daughters of Adam as Sethites.

We can thus account for the new beginning of the genealogy of Adam in chapter v., without the violent sup-

position of a separate document forced into the work. Nor do we need to have recourse to such suppositions to account for the use of the terms Elohim and Jahveh which come in as the primitive evidence of the beginnings of religion among early men. It may be well to add here some confirmatory facts from special notices in the record.

In the end of chapter iv., closing the Cainite genealogy, we have a remarkable statement respecting the Cainite Lamech, which at once becomes intelligible on the supposition that he is an example of the Cainite heroes who captured Sethite wives, while his sons, Tubal-Cain, Jabal, and Jubal, present excellent types of the men of renown who sprang from such mixed marriages. In his recorded song he refers to his having, probably in the capture of his wives, slain a man who had wounded him, and holds that this homicide in self-defence was more excusable than Cain's act of murder, and that any one injuring him on account of it would incur a heavier penalty. He addresses the poem to his wives, probably because he apprehends blood-revenge, and perhaps that his wives might betray him to their injured relatives. Thus this story of Lamech naturally closes the genealogy of Cain, and connects it with the account of the mixed marriages immediately following. The converse of this is presented by the peaceful and hopeful words of the Sethite Lamech, at the close of the genealogy of the true sons of Adam. It is impossible to doubt that the author intended to weave together these two genealogies as introductory to the wider historical statement respecting the mixed marriages which introduces us to the deluge.

In the deluge narrative itself, we find the distinction between Jahveh and Elohim preserved in all its integrity, as parts of one and the same history, in which the two capacities of the Redeemer and Creator must be duly recognised. It is as Elohim that God produces the deluge

and instructs Noah as to the ark, and finally remembers him and delivers him from the receding waters. But it is Jahveh whose spirit strives with men, and is grieved at heart with their wickedness, who grants the respite of 120 years, who instructs Noah as to clean beasts for sacrifice, who shuts in Noah into the ark, who accepts Noah's sacrifice and promises that there shall no more be a deluge, and also some alleviation of the curse on the ground. After this acceptance and promise Elohim intervenes to confirm the promise, adding His blessing and covenant, and enacting new laws for Noah and his family. Thus the distinction of the two names is consistently kept up, quite independently of any supposition of Elohist and Jahvist documents. It reminds one indeed of the distinction in the Gospels in the use of the names God, Father, Son, and Lord, by Christ and the evangelists.¹

We thus find that the right understanding of this remarkable passage unites, as by the keystone of an arch, the previously separate and apparently conflicting Jahvistic and Elohist elements of the early part of Genesis, and the seemingly fragmentary genealogies of Cain and of Seth, and brings out clearly the plan of the author in his history of early man. It furnishes also another link of connection with the Chaldean account of the deluge, for there is a certain parallelism between the rôle of Jahveh and Elohim in Genesis and that assigned to different members of the pantheon, as Bel and Hea, by the Chaldean writer. It may be asked, however, Why did the author of Genesis use a form of expression so enigmatical to his commentators, and so peculiar even with reference to later Biblical books? The answer is, Because he is so archaic a writer, and writes not for modern scholars, but for primitive folk who were familiar with facts and with modes of thought and expression which have long ago passed away. Besides,

¹ See Green on the Unity of Genesis.

he may have desired to show that the grosser forms of idolatry and of polytheism did not exist in antediluvian times, and to emphasize the fact that in religion mere theism without the idea of redemption is imperfect and misleading in the case of fallen men. It is really the archaic and simple character of the early part of Genesis that has misled modern critics. It is a book for babes, for mere children of nature, rather than for scholars, and perhaps the best commentaries on it will eventually come from the more backward and antique races of men, when they become students of the Bible, rather than from German literary workshops. To understand it we must return in imagination to the conditions to which it relates. I may mention that Jesus Christ, in His few references to early man in the Gospels, seems to enter into this antique character of Genesis; but this is a subject too wide to be taken up here.

We know a little from geological and archæological research as to primitive man, and it may be well to compare this with the record in Genesis. We must bear in mind, however, that the comparison of ancient remains with written records is always difficult, and is necessarily imperfect in its results, and that, as I have elsewhere explained, much of the land occupied by antediluvian men still remains under the sea, or is buried under alluvial deposits, so that we may never have access to the remains of the denser and more advanced communities of the period.¹ We know, however, at least three races of antediluvian men by their osseous remains, and to some extent by their works of art. They are the so-called Canstadt, Truchère, and Cro-Magnon races. The two former are respectively the lowest and highest in physical organization. The third has many of the characteristics of a half-blood between the two others. I have suspected this ever since I

¹ *The Meeting-place of Geology and History*, 1894.

knew anything of the osseous remains of this race; but it has been clearly brought out by the researches of Dr. Franz Boaz, of the United States department of ethnology, who has carefully inquired into the results of the intermixture of European and aboriginal races in America.¹ He shows that the half-bloods exhibit a marked increase in stature and physical power, especially in the men, and that they are also more variable than the pure races. Other peculiarities are also noticed, more especially a diminution in the height of the face in comparison with the brain-case. These indications are distinctly visible in the gigantic race of Cro-Magnon and Mentone. Hence we may infer that the tribes who in Europe, where the facts are best known, were cut off by the post-glacial subsidence—the geological equivalent of the Biblical deluge—consisted of a rude and a more refined race of pure blood, and a third race of gigantic hybrids, which may, when better known and traced more widely over the world, realize the old account of the antediluvian giants. I would not, however, insist too strongly on this in the present imperfect state of our knowledge. Should further discoveries confirm the present indications, the coincidence would be very striking, and would also come into harmony with prevalent traditions of gigantic primitive men.

One other question deserves a passing notice. How could so circumstantial account of the antediluvian world be transmitted to subsequent ages? The answer is that modern research has ascertained the existence of certain forms of writing among early men as far back as the deluge itself; and if the date of the early chapters of Genesis is that of the generations immediately succeeding that event, there is now no reason to doubt that the testimony of witnesses of the flood may have been recorded from their own lips. The Chaldean tablets even represent Noah as pro-

¹ *Popular Science Monthly*, October, 1894.

viding for the safety of written records before the flood began, and the earliest inscriptions of Chaldea and Egypt carry us back long before the time of Abraham, and therefore to a period when the oral testimony of survivors of the deluge might still be available.

If, like the ancient Chaldean histories and poems, their statements were inscribed on clay tablets, originals or very early copies may yet be discovered. In the meantime the version preserved, under the good providence of God, in Genesis bears internal evidence of veracity, of primitive age, and of Divine guidance in its preparation as a basis for the religious system which culminates in the advent of the Messiah as the long-delayed fulfilment of the promise originally made to our first parents, and passed on to later times by holy men inspired of God.

J. WM. DAWSON.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

IX. THE WORTH OF MAN.

JESUS believed in the absolute, infinite worth of man taken even at the lowest and meanest. But He did not express His faith in philosophical terms like infinite and absolute. He used the method of comparison. Once He employed a comparison which adequately embodied His idea: "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"¹ "Christ's maxim is—one soul outweighs the world." But usually He dealt in comparisons which seem utterly inadequate, as when in the admonition against care He asked anxious disciples: "Are ye not much better than they?" *i.e.*, than the fowls of the air.² Similarly, in a discourse on apostolic tribulations, to keep the Twelve in good heart, He said: "Fear ye not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows."³ Comparisons at the best can never express absolute truth. To say that one thing is better than another, however good the latter may be, does not amount to saying that it is the best possible. But when the object whose value is being estimated is compared with something of recognised standard worth, "better" practically means "best." So, for example, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. There also the method of comparison is used to set forth the excellence of the Christian religion. The writer's position really is: Christianity the best possible religion, the absolutely perfect, therefore the final form of man's relation with God. But he puts that position in this way: Christianity better than the Old Testament religion, with all its agents and agencies of revelation and redemp-

¹ *Matt.* xvi. 26.

² *Matt.* vi. 26.

³ *Matt.* x. 31.

tion. Practically it amounted to the same thing, because for the Hebrew Christians, for whose benefit the comparison was made, the ancient religion of the Jewish people, with its Moses and Aaron and Levitical rites, was a sacred divine institution. But "of more value than many sparrows," which have almost no worth at all, that is surely not saying much! Yet in the very inadequacy of the comparison lies its pathos and its power as addressed to men who have a depressing sense of their own insignificance. Persons in this state of mind need such humble estimates to help them to rise to higher faith and bolder self-respect, and the use of them by Jesus is signal proof of His deep sympathy, as of His poetic tact and felicity. I value greatly these simple, naïve questions of Jesus preserved for us in the synoptic Gospels as a contribution to His doctrine of man. There is nothing like them elsewhere in the New Testament; nothing so expressive and impressive, so suggestive, so humanely sympathetic, so quietly yet severely condemnatory of all unloving estimates of human worth. Compare with these questions of Jesus St. Paul's, "Doth God take care for oxen?"¹ Jesus could not have asked that question with an implied negative in His mind. His doctrine was: "God does take care even for oxen, but for men more."

These simple, kindly comparisons by which our Lord sought to indoctrinate His disciples in the worth of man to God suggest more than they say, and provoke far-reaching reflections. Better than sparrows, than all the fowls of the air, than a sheep,² or an ox.³ How? Not in all respects. Man cannot fly like the birds, or sing like the lark, or furnish material that can be manufactured into cloth like the sheep, or bear heavy burdens like the ox. The ground of his superiority is not physical but spiritual. He can think and love, and act with freedom. In these respects he is unique. Simply incomparable with "birds and four-

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 9.² Matt. xii. 12.³ Luke xiv. 5.

footed beasts," and not merely with them, but with the entire subrational universe. The principle involved in our Lord's question, "Are ye not much better than they?" is that man as a rational being and moral personality is of more value than the whole inanimate and lower animate world. This is an essential principle in the Christian theory of the universe. And it is a principle which the most recent science amply justifies. The evolutionary conception of the process by which the world as it now is came into being places man at the head of the creation. It assigns him this position just in proportion as it brings his whole nature on its spiritual not less than on its physical side within the scope of evolutionary law. When the scientist says: Man in his intellect and in his moral nature, as well as in his body, has been evolved, he declares in effect that man in his composite being is the crown and climax of the grand movement by which the present universe, with its endless variety of existences, has slowly emerged out of the primitive chaos of homogeneous matter. That being so, it follows of necessity that man is a being of unique significance. He is the key to the meaning of the universe and to the nature of its Maker. He is the end the Creator had in view in making the world. Till man arrives on the scene one feels tempted to ask, To what purpose those stars, mountains, rocks, rivers, plains, and plants, and animals of all sorts and sizes? When he makes his appearance, one begins to see that it was worth while to make a world. And one also begins to understand the nature of the Maker. He is, we see, one who has been working all through the ages towards the production of rational and moral beings. And hence we infer that He is Himself rational and moral. And as the Maker of the world had man in view as the *raison d'être* of world-making, it stands to reason that he will care for man after He has in the fulness of the time brought him into existence. He

will see to it that all rational and moral possibilities of this new type of being shall be realized, and will make all nature's laws and all events co-operate towards this end. In other words, a *Kingdom of God*, with good men for its citizens, will be God's own chief end, directing and controlling the whole course of His providence.

This is a great bold thought which the hand of even strong faith cannot at first grasp without trembling. Yet it is easier to believe that God thinks thus highly of man than for man himself to cherish such thoughts of his kind. Rather I should say that the main cause of unbelief in God's care for man is the low estimate men form of human nature in themselves and in others. Contempt of the human, whencesoever arising, is a fruitful cause of practical atheism. Who can believe that God careth for men who does not himself believe that a man is better than a sheep? And who are they who are guilty of scepticism so radical? Well, various sorts of people. Philosophers, *e.g.*, like Celsus, who deliberately maintained that man is no better than a beast, and that he is surpassed by some animals even in respect of morality and religion. Commercial men, also, who measure the worth of all things by their value as property. My sheep belongs to me, and I can sell it for so much, but that drunken good-for-nothing, what have I to do with him? He is not my slave; and even if he were, nobody would buy him. Even religious men, have needed to be reminded of the worth of man as man. How much is a man better than a sheep? was a question addressed by our Lord to *Pharisees*. They really did not believe anything of the kind. They had got into a way of setting the human and the divine in antagonism. They made man the slave of the Sabbath law in zeal for the supposed honour of the Divine Lawgiver. A sheep was a creature to be envied by comparison, as in virtue of its very irrationality lying outside the scope of the vexatious statute. For

an analogous reason they would not feel the force of the parable of the lost sheep. Yes, they would say within themselves, we can understand a shepherd going after a strayed sheep and rejoicing when he found it. It belonged to him, and moreover it was blameless. But these publicans and sinners belong neither to you nor to us; and if they are lost, it is their own fault; let them take the consequences.

In view of this inhuman type of religion then prevalent in Palestine one can appreciate the startling significance of Christ's own bearing towards the neglected classes. It was nothing short of revolutionary. It would stimulate thought on the question, What is the worth of man even at the worst? far more powerfully than any number of mild suggestions as to man being better than this or that member of the lower animal creation. These might provoke from unsympathetic hearers a sceptical smile, but the mission to the outcasts of Capernaum provoked indignation as against one who had committed a wanton outrage on the moral feelings of a God-fearing community. "Think of such scandalous people being treated even as fellow-men, not to say as comrades admitted to social privilege on equal terms!" The rude shock to the sense of propriety is the measure of the innovation inaugurated, and of the extent to which the contemporary world needed education in the elementary rights and claims of man. As the teacher of a new doctrine on this subject, Jesus could not get past that Capernaum mission and all that went along with it. The holy rage of religionists was no doubt a regrettable circumstance, but unfortunately radical reforms cannot be brought about in this world without rude initial shocks to prejudice. "Woe unto the world because of offences";¹ but blessing also comes through them. Outrage to rooted caste pride first, and it may be fierce war in defence of cherished pre-

¹ Matt. xviii. 7.

rogative, then ultimate acceptance of a beneficent moral axiom, which to disinterested, wise, humane men was self-evident from the first. Thank God for the men who bring this kind of offences. They are the world's benefactors and saviours at a great cost to themselves. For woe is to that man by whom even the beneficent offence cometh. The world calls him evil names, and is not content till it has got rid of him. But he leaves his blessing behind him, in the form of a truth that upsets partition walls, fills up gulfs of social cleavage, banishes the kingdoms of the wild beast type and ushers in the kingdom of the *human*.

So did Jesus Christ teach His new doctrine concerning the worth of man by quaint pathetic comparisons and by aggressive action, which compelled all to take note that in His judgment a man was a man, even though a publican and a "sinner." He crowned the doctrine by the name He assumed for Himself—*Son of man*. This name Jesus nowhere formally defines, any more than He defines the name He gave to God. In this case, as in that, He defines only by discriminating use. We must listen attentively as He calls Himself "*Son of man*," and strive to catch the sense of the title from the tone and accent of the speaker. To do this successfully needs a sensitive, sympathetic ear, unfilled with other sounds that blunt its perceptive faculty. Lacking such an ear, men may get very false impressions, and read all sorts of meanings into the simple phrase, collected perhaps from Old Testament texts, or suggested by systems of theology. To my ear the title speaks of one who is sympathetic and unpretentious; loves men, and advances no ambitious claims. He may be great, so to speak, in spite of Himself, by gifts and graces even *unique*; but these must speak for themselves. He will not take pains to point them out, or advertise His importance as their possessor. The Son of man wears no grand airs, but is meek and lowly. He is simply the *man*, the brother of

men, loving humanity with a passionate love which fits Him to be the world's Christ; but His personal attitude is that of one who says: "Discover what is deepest in me, and draw your own inference."

Specially instructive is the earliest instance of the use of this title by our Lord occurring in the first Gospel. Matthew introduces it for the first time in connection with the offer of a *scribe* to become a disciple.¹ The incident is recorded both by Matthew and by Luke,² but in neither Gospel is there any clear indication of its true historical setting. We may assume that it happened after the attitude of the class to which the aspirant belonged towards Jesus had been made manifest, and that the reception given to the would-be disciple was influenced by Christ's practical acquaintance therewith. Were we to take as our guide Luke, who introduces the aspirant simply as a certain person, we should, of course, lay no stress on the indication of his profession given in the narrative of Matthew. But that a scribe should offer to become a disciple was so unlikely that no reason can be assigned for its place in the tradition save that it was a fact. And just because it was unlikely we are entitled to treat the fact as important, and to interpret in the light of it both the name Jesus gave Himself and the repellant word He addressed to the candidate for discipleship.

Taking the latter first, when we remember to whom Jesus is speaking, it becomes probable that the saying, "Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have lodging-places, but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head," is to be taken parabolically. That is to say, it refers to Christ's spiritual situation as one who has no home for His soul in the religion of the time, rather than to His physical condition as one at the moment without any certain dwelling-place. Though this view suggested

¹ Matt. viii. 19, 20.

² Luke ix. 57, 58.

itself to my mind only recently, I confess that I have always felt a certain measure of dissatisfaction with the current conception of our Lord's meaning. I have never been able to see any special aptitude of the saying so understood to the case of the person addressed, nor have I been able to get rid of the feeling that the word, taken in the literal sense, is not without a certain tone of exaggerated sentiment according ill with the known character of Jesus. There does not seem to have been any great hardship in the physical aspect of the life of our Lord and His disciples, such as might scare away any one the least inclined to disciple-life. And suppose this aspirant had been admitted to the ranks of discipleship, would he not have been one more added to the number of followers possessing means sufficient to make the daily life of the Jesus-circle not without a due measure of comfort? ¹ On these grounds the suggestion that the saying about the foxes and the birds is to be interpreted parabolically came to my mind as a relief. Looked at in this light, it is seen to be at once very true and very apposite. How thoroughly true that Jesus was spiritually an alien, without a home in the religion of the time. Recall all that quite probably had happened before this incident took place: the charge of blasphemy in connection with the healing of the palsied man; the offence taken at the festive meeting with the publicans, and the scandalous charges that grew out of that event; the numerous conflicts respecting Sabbath-keeping, fasting, ritual ablutions, and the like; the infamous suggestion that the cure of demoniacs was wrought by the aid of Beelzebub; and so on. If the whole, or even a part, of these experiences lay behind Him when He uttered this word, with what truth and pathos Jesus might say, "The

¹ *Vide Luke viii. 1-3*, which Wendt regards as a kind of introduction to the passage about the three aspirants (*Luke ix. 57-62*) as it stood in the book of *Logia*.

foxes and the birds of the air are better off than I am, so far as a home for the soul is concerned." Then with what point and pungency He might say this to a *scribe*! For was it not the class the aspirant belonged to that made Him homeless? Whether viewed as an excuse for reluctance to receive him as a disciple, or as a summons to deliberate consideration of what was involved in the step he was proposing to take, the word was altogether seasonable. In the one case it meant, "You need not wonder if I give not a prompt, warm welcome to *you*, remembering all that has passed between me and the class you belong to." In the other case it means, "Consider how it is with Me. I am a religious outlaw—suspected, hated; a fugitive from those who seek my life. Are you really able to break with your class in opinion, feeling, and interest, and to bear the obloquy and ill-will that will inevitably come upon you as my disciple?"

Let us turn now to this title "Son of man," which we meet with here for the first time in Matthew's Gospel, and inquire what view of its import is most naturally suggested by the situation of Jesus as parabolically described, and by the religious connections of the party addressed. We may assume that, as in all cases probably more or less, so very specially in this case, the title was used significantly and not merely from custom. It served, that is to say, as a symbol of the religious attitude of Jesus and as a protest against the antagonistic attitude of the scribes. Wherein then did the difference between the two attitudes lie? It might be summed up in these two particulars. First, the religion of the scribes was *inhuman*; it posited an artificial false antithesis between the divine and the human interest. Second, it was *ambitious*. The spirit of pride and self-importance pervaded it throughout. This spirit found expression in the Messianic idea of the scribes as in all other parts of their system. Only a Messiah coming with worldly

pomp would please them. He must come as the son of some great one, and be in all things like his descent. We quite understand how, when Jesus asked the Pharisees (in spirit identical with the scribes), "What think ye concerning the Christ? whose son is He?" they were so ready with the answer, "The Son of *David*."¹ That was the essential point for them. Davidic descent before all things, everything else subordinate and conforming thereto.

At both points Jesus stood in irreconcilable antagonism to the scribes. He was emphatically, passionately *human*, and He was *humble*. In His whole public career, by every word and act, He was ever saying in effect: "I stand for the human, not as opposed to the divine, but as ultimately identical with it. I am jealous for God's honour, and just on that account I champion the interest of man. For I find in this land, among those who make themselves prominent in religion, a spurious zeal for the divine, whose practical issue is immorality and inhumanity. They encourage men to say 'corban,' and so excuse themselves for neglecting the duties of filial piety.² They interpret the Sabbath law of rest so strictly as to make it wrong for a man to satisfy hunger by rubbing a few ears of corn in his hands,³ or to heal a sick man on the seventh day, so bringing the Fourth Commandment into needless conflict with the higher law of mercy. Therefore I make it my business to emphasize the neglected interest, not in a one-sided way, or in the spirit of mere reaction, but as the best way of guarding that very Divine interest of which they have constituted themselves the patrons." The contrast in the other respect was not less glaring. The scribes loved titles of honour. They desired to be called of men Rabbi.⁴ It gratified their vanity, and proclaimed their importance as men who knew the law and the traditional interpretation

¹ *Matt.* xxii. 42.

² *Matt.* xii. 1-8.

³ *Matt.* xv. 5.

⁴ *Matt.* xxiii. 7.

of it current in the schools. Jesus had nothing in common with them here. He set no value on complimentary epithets or on any expressions of respect towards Himself, except in so far as they represented intelligent and sincere conviction. He declined even to be called "good" in the way of compliment by one who came to Him inquiring the way to eternal life.¹ His aversion to everything savouring of vanity, ostentation, self-importance, and self-advertisement was austere and unconquerable. He prayed not at the street corner, but amid the solitude of the mountains when men were asleep. He withdrew into the wilderness from popular admiration. He enjoined on His disciples to tell no man that He was the Christ.

The title "Son of man," as used in the reply to the scribe, was a compendious proclamation of this twofold antagonism. It said these two things: Son of *man*, in My religious tendency, zealous for the human; Son of *man*, in My estimate of Myself, as opposed to Son of *David*, the attractive title for those who desire a Messiah harmonizing with vain thoughts. Charged with such significance, it set very fully before the scribe the grave import of the step he proposed to take in becoming a disciple. That, we now clearly understand, did not lie in entering on a life of physical hardship. It rather lay here, that the aspirant to discipleship was called upon to abandon for ever Rabbinical ways of thinking and to adopt as his leader one who could make no response to current Messianic hopes. What happened? We are not told, but we are apt to take for granted that of course the scribe turned away from a Master who seemed so cynically indifferent to his approaches. Indeed we are inclined to wonder how a scribe could ever think of becoming a disciple of Jesus even if he possessed only a moderate acquaintance with His character, and are tempted to suspect that in connecting the aspirant

¹ *Mark* x. 17.

with this class the evangelic tradition is at fault. But it has to be remembered that the class-spirit does not dominate all the members of a fraternity to a uniform extent, and that Mark tells of a scribe who had considerable sympathy with the ideas of Jesus, and whom Jesus regarded with much interest as one not far from the kingdom of God.¹ It takes time for a human soul to be made an abject, willing slave of a pernicious religious system, and in the case of not a few young men of ingenuous spirit and somewhat robust moral sentiments the process is a species of martyrdom. There were doubtless among the scholars of the scribes some whose better nature revolted against the doctrines they were being taught. Such malcontents would steal away now and then from the school to hear the new Teacher, as young men and women in our cities now steal away from orthodox churches to hear some charming "heretic." And of course these runaways felt the spell of Him who taught "not as the scribes." What wonder if one at least bethought himself of breaking away from their dominion and joining the society of the Great Proscribed.

I have discussed at some length this first text in Matthew's Gospel containing the title "Son of man" because of the light which, in virtue of its setting there, it throws on the strong convictions of our Lord concerning the significance of man. My present aim is not to discuss the import of the title for its own sake, but simply in connection with what I regard as a wider and more important question, what Jesus thought of the race with which He so emphatically identified Himself. But I may say that I regard it as a happy circumstance that just this particular text is the first containing the title which we encounter in perusing the records of our Lord's ministry. For it is not only the first but the most luminous. The title *scribe* given to the

¹ Mark xii. 28-34.

aspirant furnishes the key to the title *Son of man* assumed by the Master. And the meaning struck out of the latter, like a spark out of steel by the stroke of a flint, is in turn the key to its meaning in some other texts where its sense is often misapprehended. For example, in the text "the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day."¹ The title here is not to be charged with all sorts of theological meanings, such as the "ideal man," or the man who while human is more, even divine, or the Messiah invested with full Messianic prerogative. It is not yet become a stereotyped phrase, a *vox signata*, it is a phrase whose meaning is fluid, used with conscious significance and with strict relevance to the context. And the connection requires that it should, as in the text we have so fully considered, be taken as meaning, "The man who stands for the human interest as distinct from the supposed divine interest." Christ's whole thought is: "the Sabbath was made for man, not (as you think) man for the Sabbath; therefore I, who make it My business to vindicate the claims of the neglected human, am the best judge of how the Sabbath is to be observed. I have no desire to set it aside, for as God meant it, it is a beneficent institution, but I wish and intend to restore to it its true place and function as having for its end man's good. So again in the text, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him."² The idea is not: blasphemy against the Son of man comes next to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost in heinousness, and therefore is barely forgivable. So understood, it takes its place in a climax thus: blasphemy against ordinary men forgivable, of course; blasphemy against the extraordinary ideal man barely forgivable; blasphemy against the Holy Ghost not forgivable at all. The meaning rather is blasphemy

¹ Matt. xii. 8.² Matt. xii. 32.

against the Son of man shall be forgiven just as blasphemous words against any son of man may be forgiven. If it be asked why the Son of man and sons of men in general are put on a level, we shall get light by reflecting on the source of the blasphemy against the Son of man. The main source of the blasphemies against the Son of man as a matter of fact was just *that He stood so stoutly for the human*. He identified Himself with neglected, outraged human interests, and He suffered in name and fame in consequence, and He was content to do so and took it all as a matter of course, and regarded it as in most cases the result of a pardonable misunderstanding. He associated with publicans and sinners and they called Him a drunkard, a glutton, and a philo-publican.¹ He healed on the Sabbath day and they called Him a Sabbath-breaker. He cheered the heart of the palsied man by proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and they called Him a blasphemer.² He allowed a sinful woman to touch His person, and it was inferred that if He was a good man He at all events could not be a prophet.³ He pitied the poor demoniacs and restored them to health and sanity, and they said, "He is in league with Beelzebub." It is true that in this last instance He did not take the blasphemy as a matter of course but made it the subject of grave animadversion, as if it bordered on the unpardonable. But why so? Simply because He found it impossible to believe that in this case, as in most of the others just enumerated, it was the result of a pardonable misunderstanding. He did not at all wonder that men misjudged Him when they saw Him associating with the social pariahs. Fellowship with such for their moral rescue was so new a thing, and fellowship with them from love of their evil ways so much the rule, that misconception could hardly fail to arise. The calumniated One even in

¹ Matt. xi. 19.² Matt. ix. 2, 3.³ Luke vii. 39.

that case might have His own suspicions as to the real source of the calumny, but the presumption was against Him, and He was silent. It was the penalty He had to pay for doing a daring thing at the bidding of an unexampled love and value for man even at the worst. But in the case of the Beelzebub hypothesis the position was different. The demoniacs were not regarded with moral aversion like the publicans and "sinners." They were not immoral, but simply unhappy sufferers under some supernatural influence of a malignant type. Men regarded them with feelings kindred to those we cherish towards the insane. Pity for them therefore, even if unusual in degree, offered no occasion for sinister remark. That one tried to cure them could not legitimately expose to suspicion, for such attempts were not uncommon in unsuspected quarters. The offence of Jesus in this instance was not His pity, nor His effort to succour, but His *signal success*. That made Him famous and popular, therefore it had to be explained away; or, if the fact could not be denied, its character had to be somehow blackened. The Beelzebub hypothesis was invented for this purpose. The inventors had no faith in it themselves; they simply hoped that it would throw dust in the eyes of an admiring populace. And that was why their sin appeared to Jesus so serious. It was not in His view a sin of misunderstanding against the Son of man arising out of His identifying Himself with novel or unpopular humanities, but a sin against knowledge committed by men who would say and do anything rather than admit that any good was to be found in *Him*.

I do not forget that the title "Son of man" has another side, an apocalyptic sense, connecting it with the visions of Daniel, and with the glories of the second advent. But even on that side it is not divorced from the radical sense, standing for the human. Daniel's kingdom of one like unto a son of man is a kingdom of the *human* as distinct

from kingdoms of the brutal type symbolized by wild beasts—lion, bear, leopard, or other unnamed monster more hideous and ferocious than the rest. The kingdom of the human came to its rights in the teaching and ministry of Jesus, and this constitutes His best claim to be the Christ, not mere physical descent from David, though that, as the genealogies attest, may have been a fact. And whatever apocalyptic glories may be in store for the Son of man they will never be such as to put Him out of conceit with the humanities He inaugurated, or divorce His celestial life from His life on earth. The Son of man who returns to this world, accompanied by a royal escort of angels, to take His seat as judge of men, does not forget His state of humiliation or the classes of which that state made Him a fellow. He judges men by the way in which they treat the classes who are lightly esteemed, and whom He still accounts His brethren. The glorified Son of man in the teaching of Jesus is still the man who stands for the human, whose heart burns with the “enthusiasm of humanity,” and His decisive test of character is the relation in which men stand to that sacred passion. Does it burn in their hearts? then they are the children of the Father. Are they inhuman? then their place cannot be in the kingdom prepared by the Father for those who with heart and soul have practised the humanities.¹

Christ's doctrine of man is grand, and still at the end of nineteen centuries stands above Christendom a lofty, un-reached ideal. And what shall we say of Him who taught it not by word only, but still more emphatically by deed? Surely that He has earned the eternal honour of all who seek the good of their kind. With open face we see “the Saviour and the Friend of man,” and His teaching and His example are the inspiration of all who desire to leave the world better than they found it.

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ *Matt.* xxv. 31-46.

“THE MIND OF THE MASTER.”

DR. WATSON'S volume is another sign of the extraordinary interest which has been evinced of recent years in the study of the teaching of Christ. The historical investigation of Christianity led us up to the commanding personality of its Founder as the secret of its spiritual life and of its spiritual triumphs. In consequence of the fresh attention directed to the unique rôle played by the historical Christ in the “origins of Christianity,” a fresh impetus was given to the study of the life of Christ. For more than half a century, lives of Christ have been amongst the most interesting of theological writings, both for the Biblical student and for the devout Christian reader. It was inevitable that the renewed study of the life of Christ should issue in fresh attempts to get at “the mind of Christ.” Such studies as *Ecce Homo* and Dr. Bruce's *Training of the Twelve*, indicated the growing interest in the great thoughts of God and of human life which lay at the heart of the wonderful story of the life of Christ. Since these books were published, the teaching of Christ has been investigated with a thoroughness never before exemplified in the study of the subject. It is not, perhaps, too much to say, that at the present time there is no problem in the sphere of Christian theology which excites more interest than just the determination of Christ's own thoughts regarding God and men's relations to God and to each other in God. The eagerness with which the translation of Wendt's *Lehre Jesu* has been received by English readers is an evidence of the wide-spread interest in the subject. Within recent years, there has been quite a number of little volumes—Mr. J. W. Mackail's and Mr. Elliot Stock's being amongst the best of them—which reproduce the sayings of Christ in the Gospels

under various heads of doctrine and conduct. And from many another quarter evidence is supplied to us that the teaching of the Master is receiving special study, and is gaining for itself special authority.

The title of Dr. Watson's first chapter, "Jesus our Supreme Teacher," indicates the dominant contention of the volume, that the supreme authority on questions of Christian doctrine and Christian life is to be found in the teaching of Jesus recorded in the Gospels. This principle is winning more and more the suffrages of Christian men. It may seem strange that any other principle should ever have been recognised in the Christian Church. Yet it is only in recent times that the validity of this principle has received recognition, if it can even yet be said to be recognised. The Westminster Confession of Faith gives no suggestion that the words of Christ have a supreme regulative function in the construction of doctrine. Christ's words are on a level with other words in the inspired writings. In the chapter entitled, "Of God and of the Holy Trinity," no reference is made in text or proofs to Christ's teaching on the Fatherhood of God. Of the fifty-six passages of Scripture adduced in support of the statements in this chapter, only three are words of Christ, and these are adduced merely to prove that God is "spirit" and "hath life." In the chapter on the Law of God, there is not one word to suggest that Christ has given us a deeper conception of the law of God than the Decalogue. Stranger still, though Christ has repeatedly declared His mind regarding the Sabbath and the observance of the Sabbath, no reference whatever is made in text or proofs to His teaching in the chapter entitled, "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath-day." These are but specimens of the way in which the teaching of Christ is kept in the background, or at least denied the position of supreme authority. Nor is this attitude towards the teaching of Christ peculiar to the

Confession of Faith; it is the general attitude of the doctrinal symbols of the Protestant Churches.

As long as it was assumed that every part of the Bible was equal in its inspiration, and therefore in its authority on questions of doctrine and life, it was natural that texts from the Old Testament and from the Apostolic writings should have as much weight attached to them as the very words of Christ. But that old view of inspiration is no longer tenable, at least for those who accept the modern methods of interpreting the writings of the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament religion is a growth; the history of its development can still partly be traced. There is growth in the ideas of God and duty. And in different books of the Old Testament, there are represented different stages of this growth. There is no one unvarying system of doctrine, and no one unvarying moral ideal. Doctrines and ideals are different at different periods, and different at the same period in different writers. Even in the New Testament, there are different types of doctrine. John, Paul, Peter, and James have their own individual and, in some respects, divergent ways of interpreting the revelation of God in Christ. If the progress of Biblical science has made it impossible to regard the Bible as pervaded throughout by one uniform doctrine of God, and one uniform moral ideal, if the progress of Biblical science has revealed inside the Bible development, with the imperfections and immaturities involved in development, the question is forced upon us: By what standard are we to judge the contents of the Bible? ¹ How are we to determine what belongs to the immature stages of development, and what is of abiding worth? How are we to determine what parts of the teaching are of primary importance, and what of secondary importance? Amid the variety of teaching disclosed by Biblical science, how are we "to find our bearings in the

¹ Cf. Wendt's *Die Norm des echten Christenthums*.

Bible?" Such a question presents little difficulty to the Roman Catholic theologian, who can summon to his aid Councils and Pope to guide him in determining what the Scripture teaches on doctrine and duty. The High Church Anglican with his appeal to the teaching of the historical episcopate is also provided with an instrument for the interpretation of Scripture. But if we hold with the Reformers that the teaching of Popes, Councils, Creeds and Churches, needs to be judged by Scripture, and take our stand solely on Scripture, what resource is left to us for estimating the importance to be attached to the different parts of its varied teaching? Are we at the mercy of individual caprice? Are we free to take our own favourite doctrines and make these the norm for our interpretation of Scripture? Can we, for example, take up the position of theologians who tell us that "the apostolic doctrine of Christ's work in relation to sin is the thing which gives one his bearings in the Bible?" Must our standard be chosen in this subjective fashion? Or is there some objective standard to which we can appeal?

To this question Dr. Watson replies that there is such a standard in the teaching of Jesus. For every Christian, there is surely intrinsic reasonableness in such a standard. The Christian Church confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, in closer fellowship than any other with the Father, more at home than any other in the spiritual world. It is the contention of the Christian Church that Jesus is *the* Revealer of God. To claim supreme authority for the teaching of Jesus, is only to give effect to what the Church holds regarding His relation to God and His understanding of the mind of God. It is strange, indeed, that with her doctrine of the Person of Christ, the Church should ever have consented to let His teaching occupy any other than the foremost place as an authoritative standard for doctrine and duty.

Dr. Watson is perfectly unambiguous in assigning supreme authority to the teaching of Jesus. Such a frank acceptance of a supreme authority within the Scriptures has evoked a considerable amount of adverse criticism. Not unnaturally, for the acceptance of the supreme authority of the teaching of Christ in the Gospels may carry with it changes in theological thought and in the ideals of church life. As soon as the conception has become dominant that the great thoughts of Christ are to be our supreme standard for the interpretation of the rest of Scripture, for the construction of Christian theology, and for guidance in Christian duty, it is inevitable that the old order will change, "giving place to new." I have little doubt that the new position will finally commend itself to the minds of Christian men who, in conformity with the fundamental principle of Protestantism, emphasize the supreme authority of the Bible rather than the authority of the Church and tradition, but, at the same time, it is natural that, in view of its far-reaching consequences, it should be canvassed with a considerable amount of uneasiness.

The principle for which Dr. Watson contends would be robbed of its significance if the apostolic teaching were held to be the teaching of Jesus in such a sense that as great authority attached to the words of the Apostles as to the words spoken by Jesus Himself and recorded in the Gospels. On the old theory of inspiration it was reasonable to put the words of Jesus on no higher level of authority than the words of His Apostles, for the whole Bible was equally inspired and equally authoritative. But if we accept a theory of inspiration more in harmony with the results of the scientific investigation of the writings of the Old and New Testaments, it is less easy to refuse to the words of Jesus a position of supreme authority even in relation to the words of the Apostles. It is true that Christ promised the Spirit of Truth to His disciples, and it is true

that in fulfilment of this promise many words have been spoken by His disciples for the illumination and inspiration of the Church. But can it reasonably be held that the mind of Christ is better made known to us in the words of the Apostles than in His own words? However precious may be the spiritual teaching of the Apostles, surely no interpretation of the promise of the Spirit of Truth to the disciples can lead us to believe that we are to make apostolic doctrine regulative for the interpretation of Christ's words, rather than Christ's words regulative for the interpretation of apostolic doctrine. Of course, if we held a mechanical theory of inspiration, which would make Paul as really the mouthpiece of the Spirit of Christ as Jesus Himself, the authority of an Apostle might well be as great as that of the Master, but such a theory of inspiration lies outside our consideration.

Dr. Watson has rendered good service by his pleading without reserve for the supreme authority of the teaching of the Master. This may be found to be the most valuable feature in his volume. The book has, of course, many claims on the attention of readers interested in theological questions. But, instead of dwelling on the rich suggestiveness and literary brilliance of its chapters, I propose in the remaining part of this article to draw attention to some of Dr. Watson's positions which seem to me to invite friendly criticism.

1. Some of Dr. Watson's critics have complained that he has said too little about the Person of Christ. It was scarcely within the scope of the task which he set himself to discuss the doctrine of the incarnation; and in a volume that does not pretend to be an exhaustive study of Christ's teaching, the author may be forgiven for not giving us a more thorough study of Christ's teaching regarding Himself. At the same time, the unique teaching is so distinctly the outflow of the unique personality that the key to

the teaching may best be found in the spiritual experience of the Teacher. The consciousness of Sonship with the Father was a cardinal element in this experience. The consciousness of sonship was dominant with Him even in boyhood. "Wist ye not," said He to Joseph and Mary, "that I must be about *My Father's* business?" All through the years He lived and worked, suffered and sorrowed as a Son of the Father, one with the Father in the fellowship of life and love. In this central element of His experience is found the clue to His teaching about God, about Himself and His mission, about righteousness, sin and salvation. This central element of His experience carries with it the Fatherhood of God, and the thought of God as a Father explains much of the teaching on the love, brotherhood, and social service of the Kingdom of God. If one may borrow a phrase from Immanuel Kant, the Fatherhood of God is an *architectonic* doctrine, and this doctrine has its roots in the unique religious consciousness of the Teacher. So important for the study of the teaching of Jesus is the personality of the Teacher.

2. "The Sovereignty of Character" is the first topic handled by Dr. Watson after the two introductory chapters. This chapter contains many things finely said, and not only finely said but needing to be said. We need to be reminded that Christ attached quite a supreme importance to character, that His whole mission had reference to character, that it was in the interests of character He demanded faith in Himself, and that He constituted character the final test of a man's worth or worthlessness for the Kingdom of God. The "Sovereignty of Character" is without doubt a capital feature in Christ's teaching, and on the ground of Christ's teaching Dr. Watson is justified in the vigorous protest he has made against the acceptance of correct opinions as a *substitute* for good character. But there is no incompatibility between the "sovereignty of

character" and the importance of creeds, as some of Dr. Watson's critics, misled by one or two incautious phrases, have understood him to maintain.

Dr. Watson uses strong language in rebuking various abuses of creeds, but in more than one eloquent sentence he traces the profound influence of creed on character. "History proves the necessity of a creed; experience proves its effect. . . . The whole energy of a human life, however it may have been fed on the way, and whatever common wheels it may turn, arises from the spring among the hills. Belief gives the trend to politics, constitutes the rule of business, composes the atmosphere of home, and creates the horizon of the soul. It becomes the sovereign arbiter of our destinies, for character itself is the precipitate of belief" (pp. 249, 250).

At the same time, Dr. Watson introduces an element of confusion into his discussion of the relations of creed and character. "No Church since the early centuries has had the courage to formulate an ethical creed. . . . Imagine a body of Christians who should take their stand on the sermon of Jesus, and conceive their creed on His lines. Imagine how it would read, 'I believe in the Fatherhood of God; I believe in the words of Jesus; I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life; I believe in the beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies, and to seek after the righteousness of God. . . .' Who would refuse to sign this creed? . . . For three too short years the Church of Christ had none else, and it was by holy living and not by any metaphysical subtleties the Primitive Church lived, and suffered, and conquered" (pp. 20, 21). Was the early Church founded on an ethical creed—a declaration of the virtues its members were to practise? Is the creed of the early Church not rather to be found in St.

Peter's exclamation, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"? Surely personal devotion to Christ was the basis of the Church, and one has only to read Dr. Watson's own chapter on the "Dynamic of Religion" to see how the creed of St. Peter is the best guarantee for the attainment of the Christian character sketched in the Sermon on the Mount.

3. Had the chapters on "the Fatherhood of God," and the "Dynamic of Religion" preceded the chapter on "The Sovereignty of Character," and that which contains the plea for an "ethical creed," Dr. Watson would have been less tempted to use the phrases in apparent depreciation of creeds which have called forth animadversion. At any rate these two chapters provide the necessary correction of these phrases. A similar remark might be made regarding the chapter on the Culture of the Cross in relation to that on the Dynamic of Religion. "The cross may be made into a doctrine, it was prepared by Jesus as a discipline" (p. 120). Statements like this in the first of these chapters tend to suggest that Christ is little more than a teacher of the necessity of self-sacrifice for the salvation of the soul. But one has only to read the second of these chapters to be assured that this is far from being Dr. Watson's meaning. "The beginning of the religious life was . . . to break up a man's former environment and to follow the lead of Christ. 'Believe in Me,' and 'Come to Me,' He was ever saying as if it were natural to trust Him, impossible to resist Him" (p. 184). "It is not the doctrines nor the ethics of Christianity that are its irresistible attraction. Its doctrines have often been a stumbling block, and its ethics excel only in degree . . . The life-blood of Christianity in Christ" (p. 188). "The eternal Son of God gave Himself without reserve, and anticipated that to all time men would give themselves for Him. He proposed to inspire His race with a personal devotion, and that pro-

found devotion was to be their salvation" (p. 190). One does not quite understand why Dr. Watson should treat of "The Culture of the Cross" before giving us his study of Christ's teaching on Himself and His significance for the spiritual life of humanity. Had this study come first, "the Culture of the Cross" would have had its natural place in the life of discipleship, and one or two of Dr. Watson's sentences would have been so turned as to disarm criticism. In a collection of separate papers or discourses one ought not to expect the same degree of systematic thoroughness as in a professedly scientific study, yet the "Mind of the Master" is likely to be best understood if we bear in mind that there is an organic unity in the teaching of Christ, grounded in His unique personality.

4. Some of the chapters of "The Mind of the Master" appeared in the *EXPOSITOR* under the heading "The Premier Ideas of Jesus." Chapter xi., "Optimism the Attitude of Faith"; and chapter xiv., "The Foresight of Faith," could scarcely be legitimately brought under such a heading. Dr. Watson has given us a most suggestive study of the optimism of Jesus; but, as he himself shows, the optimism of Jesus is the corollary of His teaching on the loving will of God, on the affinity of men for God and on His conception of man's true good. Dr. Watson has also given us many fine suggestions in chapter xiv. on prudence or foresight in the spiritual life; but all this part of Christ's teaching is rather an application of His premier ideas than the promulgation of new thoughts.

5. There are other two chapters in the volume which suggest a danger to be avoided in the exposition of the teaching of Jesus—the danger of putting doctrines congenial to ourselves into the mouth of Jesus. A preacher who selects a text out of the sayings recorded in the Gospels may be pardoned if he stretches the text to give countenance to his own favourite ideas, but in discourses which

profess to be an exposition of the Mind of the Master we are perhaps entitled to look for a more objective method of handling the sayings of Christ. In the chapter on sin, Dr. Watson has given us a needful reminder about the reticence of Christ on the origin of sin, and has besides given us many helpful suggestions; but I question whether the statement that sin is selfishness or an act of self-will is in any peculiar way the teaching of Christ. In the chapter on Faith the Sixth Sense we meet with many striking sentences: "Any one who shifts the centre of his life from the world which is seen to the world which is unseen deserves to be called a believer" (p. 139). "It is the part of faith to gather those hopes and feelings which lie outside the intellect, and faith must not be hampered by reason" (p. 160). "For the phenomena of the universe we look to science; for the facts of the soul to faith" (p. 151). One may reasonably question whether in this chapter Dr. Watson has not read into the teaching of Jesus more than can be discovered by objective interpretation.

6. The fact that what Dr. Watson considers one of the cardinal points in the teaching of Christ—the kingdom of God—is handled in the last chapter is a sufficient indication that it has been no part of his plan to take up his topics in logical order. A reader cannot tell to which of Christ's two great thoughts—the kingdom of God and the Divine Fatherhood—Dr. Watson assigns the highest function in explaining the mind of the Master. "The Kingdom of God" is often taken to be the fundamental thought. But a good deal can be said for beginning with the Fatherhood. The consciousness of Sonship was earlier awake in Jesus than the consciousness of Messiahship. It was indeed the consciousness of His unique Sonship which led Him to the conviction that He was the Christ of God. It was natural that He should begin His preaching with the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, for it was along that line He would

best find amongst the people a point of attachment for His message. But what was first in His preaching was not necessarily first and most fundamental in His own thoughts. The Fatherhood, moreover, explains better than the Kingdom of God, Christ's teaching on other subjects, *e.g.*, His teaching about Himself as Son of God and Son of Man, about man and man's *summum bonum*, about brotherhood and social service, about the true nature of piety and worship.

7. There is nothing more striking in Dr. Watson's chapter on the Kingdom of God than his insistence on the truth set forth in Christ's words, "the Kingdom of God is within you." "The Kingdom consists of regenerate individuals, and therefore He was always trying to create character. . . . The reformer . . . approaches humanity from the outside, and proceeds by machinery; Jesus approaches humanity from the inside and proceeds by influence" (p. 324). "He had a wide horizon. He was not content to change their circumstances, He dared to attempt something higher—to change their souls" (p. 330). In view of the emphasis which Dr. Watson lays on this aspect of Christ's teaching on the Kingdom, one finds it the more difficult to understand why he should hint that Paul and the Christian Church generally should have unduly neglected Christ's doctrine of the Kingdom. It can hardly be said that either Paul or the Christian Church has overlooked the need of a change of soul for the Kingdom of God, and it can as little be said that in his teaching on the Church Paul has thrown into the background the idea of a social organism with its links of sympathy and service. There were good grounds why the Apostles should make less use than their Master of a Jewish phrase like the Kingdom of God, but that does not hinder them from emphasizing the ideals of the Kingdom of God not only with reference to the Church but also with reference to

other aspects of the social life of men. Dr. Watson reminds us that the Kingdom of God is wider and greater than the Church as a visible institution, but the relations of the two are not quite happily set forth in such a sentence as this: "The characteristic product of the Church is ecclesiastics; the characteristic product of the Kingdom is philanthropists." The Church has been guilty of aberrations and shortcomings, but the Church can also boast of faithful service and splendid achievement even in the realization of the Kingdom of God outside the ecclesiastical sphere. The domestic, social, and political life of Christendom owes an incalculable debt to the Christian Church.

D. M. Ross.

THE INCARNATION :

A STUDY OF PHILIPPIANS II. 5-11.

(Continued from p. 177.)

IN the former part of this article we have considered the relation of the passage to the preceding context, the description of the Subject, "*Christ Jesus*," as pre-existing and continually subsisting (ὑπάρχων) *in the form of God* (ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ), and have maintained the primitive interpretation of the latter words as denoting *the fulness of the Godhead* against all attempts to assign to them any lower meaning.

We now proceed to examine the next clause, the difficulties of which have given occasion to endless discussion and the widest diversities of opinion.

ν. οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.

In the interpretation of this clause we have to determine the following questions :

(a) What is the meaning of the words ἴσα Θεῷ and their relation to μορφῇ Θεοῦ?

(b) Do they denote Christ's condition before His Incarnation, or that to which He was to attain only as His reward?

(c) What is the meaning of οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο?

(a) In the Revised Version the words ἴσα Θεῷ are translated *on an equality with God*, instead of *equal with God*, as in the Authorised Version.

The change is of great importance to the right interpretation of the whole passage.

The rendering "*equal with God*," denoting the same essential equality of nature which is already expressed by "*being in the form of God*," is evidently derived from the Latin Version, "*esse se aequalem Deo*," which passed at an early period into the theological writings of the Western Church.

It was apparently due at first to the fact that the Latin language had no adequate mode of representing the exact form and meaning of the Greek *εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*.

The neuter plural *ἴσα*, whether used adverbially or as an adjective, cannot refer to the *one* unchanging nature or essence of Deity, but denotes the various conditions or states in which it was possible for that nature to exist and manifest itself as divine.

Unfortunately this force of the neuter plural has not been very generally observed, or not quite accurately expressed.

Bishop Lightfoot says: "Between the two expressions *ἴσος εἶναι* and *ἴσα εἶναι* no other distinction can be drawn, except that the former refers rather to the *person*, the latter to the *attributes*."

The word "*attributes*" seems unfortunately to mar what might otherwise have been a well-drawn distinction; for "*attributes*" are *essential*, and the sum of the "*attributes*" makes up the whole essence; they are therefore inseparable from the very existence of the *person*.¹

The true distinction appears to be that, whereas *εἶναι ἴσος* would denote equality of nature, *εἶναι ἴσα* points to the states and circumstances, which are separable from the essence, and therefore variable, or, in a logical sense (if we may so speak with reverence), "*accidental*."

The distinction is the same as that in Latin between the Vulgate, "*esse se aequalem Deo*," and Tertullian's ² "*pariari*

¹ Compare Bruce, *Humiliation*, p. 128: "The divine attributes are the divine essence, and therefore inseparable from it."

² *Adv. Marcion*, v. 20.

Deo," "to be on a par with God," and between "*equal with God*" (A.V.), and "*on an equality with God*" (R.V.).

This use of ἴσα may be illustrated by such passages as Job xi. 12: βροτὸς δὲ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ἴσα ὄνῳ ἐρημίτῃ; and Thucyd., i. 25: χρημάτων δυνάμει ὄντες . . . ὅμοια τοῖς Ἑλλήνων πλουσιωτάτοις, both quoted by Bishop Lightfoot; and by Job xxx. 19: ἡγησάι με ἴσα πῆλῳ; and by Thucyd. iii. 14: ἐν οὗ τῷ ἱερῷ ἴσα καὶ ἰκέται ἐσμέν.

In opposition to this ancient interpretation Meyer asserts¹ "that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ cannot be something essentially different from ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, but must in substance denote the same thing, namely, the divine *habitus* of Christ, which is expressed as to its *form of appearance* by ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, and as to its internal *nature* by τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ."

Again, in the footnote to this passage he adds, that Paul "distinguishes very precisely and suitably between the two ideas representing the same state, by saying that Christ, in His divine pre-human *form of life*, did not venture to use this His God-equal *being* for making booty. Both, therefore, express the very same divine *habitus*; but the εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ is the general element which presents itself in the divine μορφή as its *substratum* and lies at its basis, so that the two designations *exhaust* the idea of divinity."

We have here two important errors, which introduce a hopeless confusion into Meyer's interpretation.

(1) The word *habitus*, which he uses to express the whole "idea of divinity," and emphasizes in both sentences by italics, is the technical Latin for σχῆμα, and is so used both in the Vulgate of v. 7, and in S. Augustine's interpretation of it, "De eo quod scriptum est: *Et habitu inventus ut homo.*"²

¹ p. 81, E. Tr.

² De diversis Quæstionibus, lxxiii.

Meyer himself has given an excellent interpretation of the word in *v. 7*: “*Σχήμα, habitus*, which receives its more precise reference from the context, denotes here the entire outwardly perceptible mode and form, the whole shape of the phenomenon apparent to the senses (1 Cor. vii. 31). . . . Men saw in Christ a human form, bearing, language, action, mode of life, wants and their satisfaction, etc., in general the *state and relations* of a human being, so that in the entire mode of His appearance He made Himself known and was recognised (ἐύρεθ.) *as a man*.”

(2) Meyer applies ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων to the “*form of appearance*,” and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ to the “*internal nature*” of Christ in His pre-existence. This interpretation is wrong as to both expressions, and actually inverts their meanings.

Μορφή, as we have shown above (pp. 171 ff.), is the “*essential form*,” or “*specific character*,” which pre-supposes the “*nature*,” and is inseparable from it. τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ describes the “*state and relations*” of a Divine Being, His modes of manifestation: it is thus not co-ordinate, but subordinate, to μορφή Θεοῦ, just as its correlative in *v. 7* is shown by Meyer himself (p. 90) to be subordinate to μορφή δούλου: “*The more precise positive definition of the mode in which He emptied Himself is supplied by μορφήν δούλου λαβών*, and the latter then receives through ἐν ὁμ. ἀνθρ. *γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι εὖρ. ὡς ἄνθρ.* its specification of mode correlative to εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.¹ This specification is not co-ordinate (De Wette, Baumgarten—Crusius, Weiss, Schenkel), but subordinate to μορφήν δούλου λαβών.

(b) The conclusion to which we have just been led by considering the meaning of the words μορφή, σχῆμα, ἴσα Θεῷ, is strongly confirmed by the general structure of *vv. 6, 7*, and the balance of the two sets of contrasted clauses.

¹ These last italics only are mine.—E. H. G.

As ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων finds its antithesis in μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, so οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ is in direct antithesis to ἀλλὰ ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν.

This latter antithetical relation is placed beyond dispute (1) by the direct opposition indicated by οὐκ . . . ἀλλά, and (2) by the necessary logical connexion of the two clauses.

For since the phrase ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν conveys of itself an incomplete idea, we are at once driven to ask, Of what did Christ empty Himself? And the only possible answer is, He emptied Himself of that which He did not regard as an ἀρπαγμὸν.¹

From this again it follows, that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ denotes something which Christ already possessed as "*being in the form of God.*" It is the condition of glory and majesty which was the adequate manifestation of His divine nature,² and which He resigned for a time by *taking the form of a servant.*

When De Wette, who acknowledges that "κενοῦν is referred to τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ," goes on to say, "and that, in so far as Jesus might have had it in His power, not in that He actually possessed it," Tholuck³ asks very pertinently, "Who ever employed the word "*empty*" in regard to the renunciation of something *not yet acquired*? Can you say that any one empties himself of that which he does not as yet possess? How much better, with the ancient school of interpreters, to refer κενοῦν to an equality of condition with God actually present, of which Christ resigned the use."

¹ Dr. Bruce (p. 23) says rightly: "Beyond all doubt, therefore, whatever τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ may mean, it points to something which both the connection of thought and the grammatical structure of the sentence require us to regard the Son of God as willing to give up."

² This explains the force of the Article τὸ εἶναι ἴ. Θε., to which Meyer draws attention as pointing back to ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπ.

³ *Disputatio Theologica*, Halle, 1848, p. 14.

De Wette's view, however, is still maintained in the third edition of Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, i. p. 417: "Now if οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο means, as cannot be doubted, *non rapiendum sibi duxit*, τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ will mean something which He did not possess before, and so something different from μορφή Θεοῦ, which belonged to Him as God."

Thomasius names Tholuck as holding this view, although in the passage quoted above from the *Disputatio Theologica* he argues expressly and, as it seems, conclusively against it.

The statements of Thomasius that the meaning "*non rapiendum sibi duxit* cannot be doubted," and that "all other meanings, *non prædam sibi duxit*, or, 'He would not hold it fast pertinaciously,' cannot be justified lexically," are mere arbitrary assertions, which cannot themselves be justified in relation to the context.

We thus get rid of the chief cause of error and confusion in the interpretation of the whole passage, namely, the notion that Christ emptied Himself of the "*form of God*." This view, though adopted by Meyer, Alford, and other interpreters,¹ is so directly opposed to the meaning of the words, ὑπάρχων, μορφή, ἴσα Θεῷ, and also to the antithetical arrangement and logical connexion of the several clauses, that I cannot refrain from expressing my firm conviction that it must in the end be regarded as utterly untenable by every competent Greek scholar, who will examine the arguments opposed to it carefully, and without dogmatic prejudice.

(c) Assuming, as we now may, that "*the being on an equality with God*" was something which Christ possessed prior to His Incarnation, and then for a time resigned, we

¹ Bruce, *Humiliation*, p. 26: "All that can be confidently affirmed is, that the Apostle does conceive the Incarnation under the aspect of an exchange of a divine form for a human form of being: so that, as expositors, we are not entitled to interpret the words, *being in the form of God* as meaning 'continuing to subsist in divine form.'"

have next to consider and choose between two meanings of the word *ἀρπαγμόν*.

Does it here denote an *action*, a “robbery” (A.V.), or the *object* of an action, “a prize” (R.V.)? In other words, has it an active or a passive signification?

The course of the following inquiry will perhaps be made clearer, if we first show in a free paraphrase the two interpretations to which we are led by the different senses ascribed to *ἀρπαγμόν*.

1. With the active sense “robbery” or “usurpation” we get the following meaning:

“Who *because* He was subsisting in the essential form of God, did not regard it as any usurpation that He was on an equality of glory and majesty with God, *but yet* emptied Himself of that co-equal glory, by taking the form of a created servant of God.”

2. The passive sense gives a different meaning to the passage:

“Who *though* He was subsisting in the essential form of God, *yet* did not regard His being on an equality of glory and majesty with God as a prize and treasure to be held fast, *but* emptied Himself thereof, etc.”

In favour of the active sense it is urged (1) that this is the meaning of *ἀρπαγμός* in the only known instance of its use by a classical writer, Plutarch, *de Puerorum Educatione*, p. 12A: τὸν ἐκ Κρήτης καλούμενον ἀρπαγμόν; (2) that the passive sense would be more properly expressed by the very usual form *ἄρπαγμα*.

Both these arguments are true, but neither of them decisive.

(1) We cannot attach much importance to the passages quoted by Bishop Lightfoot from Christian writers of the

4th and 5th centuries to show that ἄρπαγμός is equivalent to ἄρπαγμα, because this later usage is probably derived from the very passage before us. But we may fairly say that the single passage from Plutarch, in which the active sense is found, is not sufficient to prove that the word could not have been used in the passive sense in St. Paul's time.

To the arguments urged against the passive sense (2) Bishop Lightfoot replies that "as a matter of fact substantives in -μός are frequently used to describe a concrete thing, *e.g.*, θεσμός, χρησμός, φραγμός, etc."

Of these examples θεσμός and χρησμός are hardly relevant, as these words have no alternative forms in -μα. But φραγμός is a very good instance.

In Herodotus vii. 36, it is applied to the "fence" or "bulwark" on either side of Xerxes' bridge, constructed to prevent the baggage-animals from seeing the water: φραγμὸν παρείρυσαν ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν.

In Herodotus viii. 52 we read that the Persians, having attached lighted tow to their arrows, ἐτόξευον ἐς τὸ φράγμα, the φράγμα being the barricade of planks and timbers with which the Athenians had tried to fortify the Acropolis.

It is evident that φραγμός in the former passage has the same passive sense as φράγμα in the latter.

Another good example is found in the usage of σταλαγμός, which, with its cognate στάλαγμα, exactly corresponds to ἄρπαγμός, ἄρπαγμα.

Thus we read in Æschyl., *Eum.*, 802:

ἀφείσαι δαιμόνων σταλάγματα;

and in Sophocles, *Antig.*, 1239:

καὶ φυσιῶν ὄξειαν ἐκβάλλει πνοήν
λευκῇ παρειᾷ φοινίου σταλάγματος.

With these passages compare Æsch., *Theb.*, 60:

πεδία δ' ἄργηστῆς ἀφρὸς
χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ἵππικῶν ἐκ πνευμόνων ;

and *Eum.*, 247 :

τετραυματισμένον γὰρ ὡς κύων νεβρόν,
πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σταλαγμὸν ἐκμαστεύομεν.

Soph., *Fragm.*, 340 :

Λάμπει δ' ἀγνιεύς βωμὸς ἀτμίζων πυρὶ
σμύρνης σταλαγμούς, βαρβάρους εὐοσμίας.

Eurip., *Ion.*, 351 : ἦν δὲ σταλαγμὸς ἐν στίβῳ τις αἵματος.
It is evident that in these latter passages σταλαγμός has exactly the same meaning as στάλαγμα in the former.

While these examples suffice to show that ἄρπαγμός may have a passive sense, its combination with ἡγήσατο renders this probable in the present passage. For Bishop Lightfoot has shown that "with such verbs as ἡγείσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, νομίζειν, etc., ἄρπαγμα is employed like ἔρμαιον, εὔρημα, to denote 'a highly prized possession, an unexpected gain.'"

The two quotations most pertinent, as containing both ἄρπαγμα and ἡγείσθαι, are *Heliodorus*, vii. 20 : οὐχ ἄρπαγμα οὐδὲ ἔρμαιον ἡγείται τὸ πρᾶγμα ; and *Titus Bostr.*, c. *Manich.*, i. 2, ἄρπαγμα ψευδῶς τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς φύσεως ἡγείται. These passages are both from writers of the 4th century, the only example given from an author nearly contemporary with St. Paul being *Plutarch.*, *de Alexandri Fort.*, 330D : οὐδὲ ὥσπερ ἄρπαγμα καὶ λάφυρον εὐτυχίας ἀνελπίστου σπαράξαι καὶ ἀνασύρασθαι διανοηθεῖς.

We proceed to consider the objections which have been urged by recent commentators against the active sense of ἄρπαγμόν, "usurpation," or "robbery."

(1) *Hofmann* in the *Schriftbeweis* (vol. i. p. 149) argued that "a state" (τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ) "cannot properly be regarded as an act."

The objection, which Meyer met by referring to 1 Timothy vi. 5, *πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*, was expressly withdrawn by Hofmann in his Commentary on the Epistle, p. 61: "As to the phrase *ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τι*, it must before all be admitted that *ἀρπαγμὸν*, in consequence of its termination, does not mean an object of robbery, either past or future, but the robbing as the action of the robber."

We may therefore set aside this objection as invalid.

(2) A second objection has reference to the meaning assigned in this interpretation to *ἀλλά*, as being virtually equivalent to *ἀλλ' ὅμως*.

Against this Bishop Ellicott argues very strongly as an undue expansion of the meaning of *ἀλλά*, and as not retaining "its usual, proper, and logical force after the negative clause."

Bishop Lightfoot also calls this rendering of *ἀλλα* "unnatural in itself."

I am not myself disposed to advocate the rendering in the present passage; but with all the deference due to such eminent scholars I venture to think that the expressions used in enforcing their objections are not altogether free from exaggeration.

That *ἀλλά* is in fact sometimes used by St. Paul in this meaning after a negative clause, cannot well be denied in face of such passages as Romans v. 13: *Sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless (ἀλλά) death reigned, etc. (R.V.)*; and 1 Corinthians iv. 4: *I know nothing against myself; yet (ἀλλά) am I not hereby justified (R.V.)*.

On the other hand it must be fully admitted that this sense of *ἀλλά* after a negative (*οὐκ . . . ἀλλά*) is very rare in comparison with its more ordinary meaning, "but," expressing a direct contrast to what has gone before.

(3) A third and much more valid objection is based on

the relation of οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο to the preceding and following context.

Thus Dr. Martin Routh, commenting on the quotation of Philippians ii. 6, in the *Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, writes thus (*Rel. Sacr.*, I. p. 364): "However the words, οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, are to be interpreted, this at least is certain, that the Lyonnais drew from them a proof of Christ's humility (τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης). Nor they alone, but also many other ancient writers did the same; nay more, I will undertake to say that up to the time of the Nicene Council no ecclesiastical writer can be adduced who has clearly and plainly indicated that these words mean, in accordance with the rendering in our English Version, 'thought it not a thing alien to Himself.'"

By "alienum a se" Dr. Routh appears to mean "a thing obtained, or to be obtained, only by usurpation or robbery; he thus rejects the meaning, "He regarded it as His own by right."

The same view is strongly urged by the ablest of our English commentators, such as Bishop Ellicott, Bishop Lightfoot, and Dean Gwynn in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

They argue with undeniable force (a) that the rendering "thought it not robbery" is *an assertion of rightful dignity*, and that, in a "prominent and emphatic sentence" (Gwynn), where we are led to expect "an instance of self-abnegation or humility," exemplifying the principle in v. 4, *not looking each to his own things, but each also to the things of others*.

"We expect this appeal to our great Example (v. 5) to be followed immediately by a reference, not to the right which He *claimed*, but to the dignity which He renounced. . . . The mention of our Lord's condescension is thus postponed too late in the sentence" (Lightfoot). (b) A further objection is thus stated by Dean Gwynn: "The

following verse (7), describing the act by which He 'emptied Himself,' brings it into the sharpest contrast by the introductory 'but' (ἀλλά, *i.e.*, 'but on the contrary,' as in vv. 3, 4) with that which is conveyed by the verb (ἡγήσατο) of this sentence. But 'to think it robbery to be equal with God' stands in no such contrast with 'to empty Himself.' To say 'He did not count it a wrongful act to assert Divine Attributes (?), but on the contrary laid them aside,' is unmeaning."

Admitting the force of these arguments, we believe the right meaning of the clause to be that the Son of God did not regard His being on equal conditions of glory and majesty with God as a prize and treasure to be held fast, but emptied Himself thereof.

Before passing on, we may do well to observe the perfect accuracy with which St. Paul applies the verbs ὑπάρχειν, εἶναι, and γίνεσθαι, the first to the eternal *subsistence* of "the form of God," the second to states and conditions *existing at a particular time*, but presently to be laid aside, and the last (γενόμενον) to *the entrance upon a new existence* "in the likeness of men."

vi. Passing to the next clause, ἀλλὰ ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, we observe that—

(1) The position of ἐαυτόν before ἐκένωσεν lays an emphasis upon the thought that the self-emptying was Christ's own voluntary act,¹ an act corresponding to the precept in v. 4, μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι σκοποῦντες.

(2) The verb κενώω is sometimes followed by a Genitive denoting "*the contents*" which are removed, as in Plato, *Republ.*, viii. 560D: τούτων . . . κενώσαντες τὴν . . . ψυχὴν.

¹ Chrysost. *in loc.* : Ποῦ οἱ λέγοντες ὅτι ἀνάγκην ὑπέστη, ὅτι ὑπετάγη; Ἐαυτόν, φησὶν, ἐκένωσεν, ἐαυτὸν ἐταπεινώσεν.

Sympos., 197c : οὗτος . . . ἡμᾶς ἀλλοτριότητος κενοῖ.

And Plutarch, *Apophth. Lacon.*, 229D : τὴν ψυχὰν κενῶσαι κακῶν.

When, as in *Phil.* ii. 7, there is no Genitive expressed, the idea of *the contents* must be gathered from the context ; and in this case the antithetical relation between τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ and ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, enforced as it is by the *direct* contradiction οὐκ . . . ἀλλά, leaves no room for doubt.

Accordingly the only admissible interpretation is that which was given by the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 269) in the *Epistle to Paul of Samosata* before his deposition :¹ οὗ χάριν ὁ αὐτὸς Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς . . . ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πάσῃ πεπίστευται Θεὸς μὲν κενώσας ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἄνθρωπος δὲ καὶ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα.

“On which account the same God and man Jesus Christ in all the Church under heaven has been believed in as God having *emptied Himself from being on an equality with God*, and as man of the seed of David according to the flesh.”

When Meyer asserts (p. 88) that Christ “emptied *Himself*, and that, as the context places beyond doubt, of the *divine μορφή*, which He possessed, but now exchanged for a *μορφή* δούλου,” he simply repeats, with ill-founded confidence, that identification, or, rather we may say, confusion of *μορφή* Θεοῦ with τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, which has been shown above (p. 243) to be the chief cause of so much erroneous interpretation of the passage.

vii. In the next clause (*μορφήν δούλου λαβών*) the action of the participle *λαβών* coincides in time with that of the verb *ἐκένωσεν*. The state of glory and majesty implied in *the being on an equality with God* was laid aside in the act of *taking the form of a servant*.

¹ Cf. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.*, tom. iii. p. 298.

On the meaning of "*servant*" in this passage, Bishop Lightfoot writes: "For ἄνθρωπος the stronger word δοῦλος is substituted: He, who is Master (κύριος) of all, became the slave of all. Comp. Matt. xx. 27, 28; Mark x. 44, 45."

But this reference of δοῦλος is decisively rejected by Bishop Bull, *Primitive Tradition on the Deity of Christ*, vi. 21, a passage briefly referred to by Bishop Ellicott: "It is to be observed that *the form of a servant* by no means signifies here a servile condition of man, in as far as it is opposed to the state and condition of a man who is free and his own master, as the heretics contend, and some Catholics have imprudently admitted.

For *the form of a servant* is here manifestly contrasted with *the form of God*. And in comparison with God every creature has the form of a servant, and is bound to obedience towards God. Hence the Apostle . . . presently adds γενόμενος ὑπήκοος, *became obedient*, namely, to God the Father."¹

The full significance of the title, *form of a servant*, is explained at great length by Dean Jackson in his admirable *Commentaries upon the Apostles' Creed*, bk. viii. capp. 7ff., where he argues that when Christ "did in the fulness of time take our nature upon Him, He did wholly submit His reasonable will, all His affections and desires, unto the will of His Heavenly Father: and in this renouncing of the arbitrament of His will, and in the entire submission of it unto the will of His Father, did that *form of a servant*, whereof our Apostle speaks, formally consist."

The true meaning of μορφή in the expression *form of God* is confirmed by its recurrence in the corresponding phrase, *form of a servant*.

It is universally admitted that the two phrases are directly antithetical, and that "*form*" must therefore have the same sense in both.

¹ Cf. *Def. Fid. Nic.*, P. i., L. ii., c. 2, § 2.

The argument to be drawn from this acknowledged fact is well expressed by Chrysostom in his Commentary on the Epistle: "What then should we say in answer to Arius, who said that the Son is of other substance (than the Father)? Tell me, what is the meaning of this—'*He took the form of a servant*'? He became man, says Arius. Therefore also *subsisting in the form of God*, He was God. For the word used in both places is *μορφή*. If the one (*μορφή δούλου*) is true, the other is true: *the form of a servant*, man by nature; therefore *the form of God*, God by nature."

We thus see that the full and proper meaning of *μορφή* is not less essential to the doctrine of Christ's true humanity than to that of His perfect deity, as presented in this passage.

It is sometimes asserted that in taking *the form of a servant* it was necessary to be divested of *the form of God*; in other words, that the two natures in their fulness and perfection could not exist together in one Person.¹

Thus Dr. Gore² writes, "The question has been asked, Does St. Paul imply that Jesus Christ abandoned the *μορφή Θεοῦ*?" And his answer is, "I think all we can certainly say is that He is conceived to have emptied Himself of the divine mode of existence (*μορφή*) so far as was involved in His really entering upon the human mode of existence. St. Paul does not use his terms with the exactness of a professional logician or scholastic."³

I have always found it dangerous to assume that St. Paul was inexact in his use of language, especially in passages which have an important doctrinal significance; and I have been led by frequent experience to the conclusion that the

¹ See above, p. 170.

² *Dissertations on subjects connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 88f.

³ In like manner Canon Gore's Reviewer in *The Guardian*, 1st January, 1896, says that "St. Paul must have been using the word 'form' in a loose popular sense, as we use the word 'nature,'"

fault lay in my own want of a clear perception of the Apostle's meaning, and not in any vagueness of expression on his part.

Such, I believe, is the cause of Canon Gore's difficulty in the present instance.

He has not grasped the true meaning of *μορφή Θεοῦ*, and the distinction between it and *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*. This is very evident in the following passage, in which the italics are mine, and are meant to call attention to the uncertainty of Canon Gore's interpretation, and his confusion of the two phrases. "The word 'form,' transferred from physical shape to spiritual type, describes—as St. Paul uses it, alone or in composition, with uniform accuracy—the *permanent characteristics* of a thing. Jesus Christ then, in His pre-existent state, was living in the permanent characteristics of *the life* of God.

In such a life it was His right to remain. It belonged to Him.

But He regarded not His *prerogatives* as a man regards a prize he must clutch at. For love of us He abjured *the prerogatives of equality with God*.

By an act of deliberate self-abnegation, He so emptied Himself as to assume *the permanent characteristics* of the human or servile life."

Now though St. Paul, we have been told above, "does not use his terms with the exactness of a professional logician or scholastic," yet *μορφή* must be an exception, for here we are told that he uses it "with uniform accuracy." First then it describes "*the permanent characteristics of a thing*," that is, in this case, "the permanent characteristics" of God; then, with a slight but not unimportant modification, "the permanent characteristics of the *life* of God"; then, with a further change, it means "*prerogatives*," and so at last "*the prerogatives of equality with God*." When we add to this series of transformations Dr. Gore's previous

definition of *μορφή Θεοῦ* as "the divine mode of existence," we certainly find a great want of "exactness," which cannot, however, be laid to the charge of the Apostle.

viii. In the following clause the meaning of *taking the form of a servant* is more closely defined by the words *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, *being made in the likeness of men*.

The relation of this clause to the preceding is well stated by Bishop Bull, *Primitive Tradition*, vi. 21: "Christ took the form of a servant at the time when He was made man. This is clear from those words of the Apostle, *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφήν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, in which there is a continuous *ἐξήγησις*, whereby the latter clause is subjoined to the former immediately (*ἀμέσως*), without the interposition of any copulative conjunction. If you ask how Christ emptied Himself, the Apostle answers, *by taking the form of a servant*. If you ask again, how Christ took the form of a servant, the answer follows immediately, *being made in the likeness of men*, that is, being made man, like unto us men, sin only excepted."

The expression *likeness of men* does not of itself necessarily imply, still less does it exclude or diminish, the reality of the nature which Christ assumed. That, as we have seen, is declared in the words *form of a servant*. "Paul justly says: *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*, because, in fact, Christ, although certainly perfect man (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 5), was, by reason of the divine nature present in Him, not *simply and merely* man, not a *purus putus homo*, but the *Incarnate Son of God*."¹

The plural *ἀνθρώπων* is used because Christ's humanity represented that which is by nature common to all men.

¹ Meyer, after Theophylact and Chrysostom: compare Fritzsche, *Rom.* viii. 3.

Thus Hooker, *E.P.*, v. cap. 52, § 3, writes: "It pleased not the Word or Wisdom of God to take to itself some one person among men, for then should that one have been advanced which was assumed and no more, but Wisdom, to the end she might save many, built her house of that Nature which is common unto all; she made not this or that man her habitation, but dwelt in us."

ix. The next participial clause, καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, belonging to the following verb ἐταπείνωσεν, declares what Christ appeared to be in the eyes of men, and so prepares the way for the statement of that further humiliation to which He submitted at their hands. As μορφή and ὁμοίωμα describe what He was in Himself as Man, so σχῆμα denotes the entire outwardly perceptible mode and shape of His existence. This meaning is well brought out by Meyer: "Men saw in Christ a human form, bearing, language, action, mode of life, wants and their satisfaction, etc., in general the *state and relations* of a human being, so that in the entire mode of His appearance He made Himself known and was recognised (εὐρεθεὶς) as a man."

The clause gives no real support to the docetic view of Christ's humanity, which Marcion¹ of old, and Baur in modern times (*Paul*, ii. p. 52, E. Tr.) tried to find in it, but rather implies the contrary. In the whole mode and fashion of His life, in every sensible proof whereby a man is recognised and known as man, Christ was so recognised and known and found as man.

Moreover the docetic view of the passage is utterly excluded by its spirit, as is very ably shown by Dr. Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, p. 31: "The form of a servant ascribed to the Incarnate One implies likeness to men in their present condition in all possible respects; for how could one be in earnest with the servant's work whose humanity was

¹ Tertullian, c. Marcion, v. cap. 20.

in any sense doketic? Then, from the mind in which the Incarnation took its origin the complete likeness of Christ's humanity to ours may be inferred with great confidence. He who was not minded to retain His equality with God, was not likely to assume a humanity that was a make-believe or a sham. It would be His desire to be in all things 'like unto His brethren.' "

x. The words *He humbled Himself* mark a distinct and further step in that self-humiliation which began when He emptied Himself of His Godlike majesty and glory. Both acts were voluntary (as is expressly shown by the use of the word *ἑαυτόν* in each case), both sprang from the same mind and spirit of loving self-sacrifice, and both were accompanied by the same self-consciousness of deity,¹ which is implied in the fact that, as is shown above, He was still *subsisting in the form of God*. It is this continuous self-consciousness of the Son of God that gives the true measure of His transcendent humility in every act of submission to His Father's will, in suffering patiently endured, in man's ingratitude meekly borne, and finally in obedience *unto death even the death of the cross*.

xi. vv. 9-11. The extreme and final depth of Christ's self-humiliation in submitting to His shameful death finds its immediate and necessary reward in an exaltation proportionately great. Thus the Apostle's exhortation to the Philippians to *have the same mind which was also in Christ Jesus* is finally enforced by the promise of a glorious reward for themselves, which, though not expressed, is necessarily implied in this supreme fulfilment of the divine law that *he that humbleth himself shall be exalted*. It is important to observe that this exaltation applies to Christ

¹ Meyer, p. 97 (E. Trs.): "The self-consciousness of Christ necessarily remained the self-consciousness of the Son of God developing Himself humanly."

primarily and properly in His human nature only. This distinction was carefully maintained by Athanasius and other Fathers against the Arians, who, denying the eternal generation of the Son, argued from the "*wherefore*" in this passage, that, being exalted as the reward of His work on earth, Christ was "therefore called both Son and God, without being very Son."¹ To this Athanasius replies that, "As Christ died and was exalted as man, so, as man, is He said to receive what, as God, He ever had, that even such a grant of grace might reach unto us."²

"For as He was ever worshipped as being the Word, and *subsisting in the form of God*, so being the same, and having become man, and been called Jesus, He none the less has the whole creation under foot and bending their knees to Him in His Name, and confessing that the Word's becoming flesh, and undergoing death in flesh, has not happened against the glory of His Godhead, but '*to the glory of the Father*.' For it is the Father's glory that man, made and then lost, should be found again; and when dead, that he should be made alive, and should become God's temple."³

We may now look back for a moment on the results of our interpretation, so far as they affect the inferences that may, or may not, rightly be drawn from the passage in regard to the Person and Natures of Christ in His state of humiliation.

1. We have seen that the word *ὑπάρχων*, *subsisting*, as used by St. Paul, denotes both the pre-existence and the continued existence of Christ *in the form of God*; pp. 163-169.

2. In illustration and confirmation of Bishop Lightfoot's interpretation of the word *μορφή* as "essential form," it has been shown that this sense was well known to contem-

¹ Athan., c. *Arian.*, i. § 37.

² § 42.

³ *Ib.*

poraries of St. Paul, that it was adopted generally by the early Greek Fathers, and advisedly restored to our English Bible by the Translators of the Authorised Version in A.D. 1611; pp. 169-173.

3. We have examined the opposite theory of those who contend that the *form* is separable from the *nature* and *essence*, that they can exist without it, and that in the Incarnation the Son of God did in fact empty Himself of the *form*, while retaining the essential nature, of deity. This error has been traced to its source in the false definitions of Zanchi; and it has been shown that the Son could not possibly empty Himself of the *form* of God without thereby ceasing to be God in any true sense, pp. 173-176.

4. Next we have seen that ἴσα Θεῷ denotes the manifold circumstances of glory and majesty, or the particular modes of manifestation, which were an adequate expression of the divine nature of the Son, but not inseparable from it, pp. 242-245.

5. It has been seen that the meaning of the clause οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, and its direct antithesis to ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, clearly prove that what the Son of God laid aside at the Incarnation was that equality of conditions, such as glory, majesty, and honour, which He possessed in His pre-existent state, and to which He prayed to be restored, in John xvii. 5: *And now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was*, p. 246.

6. We have seen how the Apostle sets forth on the other hand the fulness of Christ's humanity in a climax advancing from its most general to its most special features,—from that *form of a servant* which includes all God's creatures as

ministers of His who do His pleasure,—to that likeness of men which unites Him with us in our true nature as made in the image of God,—and finally to that outward guise and fashion, in which He was seen as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, humbling Himself yet further in obedience to His Father's will unto death, even the death of the cross, pp. 254–259.

St. Paul has thus shown us in brief outline the essential features of the Incarnation, the perfect Godhead and perfect Manhood united in one Divine Person, and “never to be divided,” seeing that the Human nature, denoted in the name Jesus, is now highly exalted in inseparable union with the Divine.

But as to the manner in which those two natures are united in one Person,—as to the degree in which the Deity was limited or the Humanity exalted by their union, *during Christ's life on earth*, the Apostle has said nothing whatever in this passage.

In fact, the precise manner of this union has been justly described by one of the best English divines of a former age as “a mystery the most to be admired by all, and least possible to be expressed by any living man, of all the mysteries whose belief we profess in the Apostle's Creed, the mystery of the Blessed Trinity alone excepted.”¹

If then the conclusions warranted by the language of St. Paul leave much still unexplained and incomprehensible to man's understanding in the mystery of Christ's Holy Incarnation, they may yet be justly said to reveal as much as is needed for the confirmation of our faith.

The continuance in Christ of *the form of God* assures us that at least the moral attributes of the Godhead are faithfully represented in the one perfect image of the Father,

¹ Jackson, *On the Creed*, vii. c. 30.

His Incarnate Word. And thus His every act of tender compassion, of patient endurance, and of loving self-sacrifice shines out in its perfect beauty as a revelation of God's own nature, and of His gracious disposition towards us.

If on the other hand *the form of God* is laid aside in *taking the form of a servant*, and the influence of the Divine nature thus suppressed, as in kenotic theories, the life of Christ on earth may still serve for our example, by showing what *man* may possibly attain when endued with the fullness of grace and power by the Holy Spirit; but by ceasing to be a direct revelation of the character of God it loses the power "to clothe eternal love with breathing life."¹

E. H. GIFFORD.

THE DISSOLUTION OF RELIGION.

MARK XII. 38-40. MATTHEW XXIII. LUKE XX. 45-47 (XI. 37-52).

BEFORE Jesus left the Temple for the last time He spoke at less or greater length upon the characteristic features of Jewish religion as they were incessantly obtruded on His notice. Its various types and representatives, scribes and Pharisees, lawyers and Herodians, had assailed Him one after another with tempting questions; the whole moral phenomenon had been, as it were, paraded before Him; and it was natural that when He had cleared the field of His insidious enemies He should speak out the impression they made upon Him. In Mark and Luke all we find is a few lines warning the disciples, "in the hearing of all the people," to beware of the scribes, with their ambitious vanity, hypocrisy, and greed; in Matthew there is a long discourse, addressed to "the multitudes and the disciples," in which the religion of the scribes and Pharisees is elaborately characterized, and a sevenfold woe pronounced upon

¹ Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 289.

it. Part of this discourse is found in Luke (xi. 39-52) in a different connection. Jesus delivered it, we are told, at the table of a Pharisee who had invited Him to dine with him. Possibly this was the original occasion of the sayings about the cup and the platter, though, as they stand in the third Gospel, they seem rather violent and unprovoked, and, if we compare them with the corresponding report in Matthew, probably not so clearly understood by the evangelist; but, in any case, they are part of our Lord's verdict on a decadent religion, and as such have an appropriate place in the great denunciation in Matthew. When one critic tells us that the three verses in Mark are the original, and another that they are a meagre extract from Matthew, we can say that synoptic criticism has got past such alternatives; we know that the whole of the matter in the passages noted at the head of this paper belongs to what is oldest and best authenticated in evangelic tradition, and we can study it without misgiving as our Lord's judgment on the Jewish religion in the last stages of its decay.

The judgment is delivered with all possible publicity: "He spoke to the multitudes." On the other great occasion on which Jesus came into conflict with the current religion (Matt. xv. 1-20; Mark vii. 1-23) it was the same: "He called to Him the multitude, and said, Hear, all of you, and understand." In one sense our Lord, like every reformer or restorer of religion, made His appeal from the conventions of a religion which had become professional to the unsophisticated conscience of mankind. A religion, He constantly implied, which is not everybody's affair is not true. A religion which can only belong to a class, which cannot be observed and enjoyed except under special conditions, which generates and is supported by an artificial conscience, is not true. True religion appeals to the common conscience and the light of day; it is level to the intelligence and the life of all mankind. To make it pro-

fessional is to ruin it ; even to maintain a professional class in connection with it, necessary as it may be, is to expose both it and them to the gravest peril.

Jesus recognises frankly the authority of the scribes and Pharisees as the successors of Moses. He never doubted the reality or the worth of the revelation enshrined in the Old Testament, for He had come Himself to fulfil the law and the prophets ; and as the scribes only claimed to interpret, and the Pharisees to apply, the law, their work was at least in idea legitimate. In an earlier encounter, indeed, Jesus had denounced the traditional legislation as virtually annulling the law of God ; but here, to begin with, He lets it pass. What He emphasizes is not the contradiction between the teaching of the scribes and the law they profess to interpret, but the contradiction between their teaching and their conduct. " They say and do not." This is the danger of professionalism in religion. It is not like a sunken rock, on which one might strike unawares ; it is rather like a cliff with a beacon perpetually burning on it, yet for ever crowded with new wrecks. It seems to be fearfully difficult for a man whose business it is to teach religion to escape from the delusion that in teaching he has exhausted his responsibility towards it. The more exclusive the professional class becomes, the more separate, collectively, from the body of the Church, the more serious is this danger ; and in looking back even on the history of Christianity, one cannot see how it could have been preserved from moral dissolution but for the incessant revolt from beneath of the unsophisticated conscience of the multitudes.

According to Luke, this reproach (xi. 46) was addressed to the lawyers ; of the Pharisees it could hardly be said, They say and do not. Doing was their strong point. They not only did all the law prescribed, but a great deal more. But their doing was vitiated by its motive : " all

their works they do to be seen of men." This too, with all that it involves, belongs to the decadence of religion; it is an ominous symptom that the heart of truth and reverence has been eaten out of it. But for the fact that Christian history itself is an illustrated commentary upon it, one would read with amazed incredulity the description of professional vanity and ambition among the Jews. If true religion is anything, it is the consciousness of God; it fills the soul with reverence, with humility, with a horror of ostentation. But if a man thinks he knows more about religion than others—and how can the member of a professional religious class avoid thinking so?—must he not, almost inevitably, presume upon this superiority, and make claims, and indulge a temper, which are fatal to the very existence of religion? Men see in such a case what the professional religionist wants, and are ready for their own ends, which have nothing to do with religion, to meet him more than half way. Unless he is utterly blinded by conceit, the modern teacher of religion must sometimes be humiliated by having the claims which are supposed to be made by his order only too willingly conceded—by getting the chief seat at feasts, or greetings in the market place, or honorary titles and degrees, from men whose indifference to religion is all that is certain about them. Yet so deep-seated in human nature is this pitiable vanity that at this point, and at this alone, Jesus interrupts His discourse to warn His own disciples especially against it. "Call you no man Rabbi. Call no man your Father on earth. Neither be ye called leaders." Such vain honours as marked the decadence of religion among the Jews were neither to be given nor received among Christians.

Thus far the discourse of Jesus has had a certain generality, but He now proceeds to expose and denounce in detail the vices of the corrupt religion of the Jews. The beatitudes in the fifth chapter of Matthew reveal in

heavenly beauty and attractiveness the true characters of religion; to compare with them the maledictions of this chapter is to get a tremendous illustration of the aphorism—*corruptio optimi pessima*. Nothing could be more repulsive than the character on which Jesus here passes solemn sentence; yet it is the character of men who thought themselves, and were thought by others, more than commonly religious. Its features are those of all religious delusion, and it is not difficult to apply them to the corruptions of Christianity itself.

The first woe is denounced upon exclusiveness. "You shut the kingdom of heaven in men's faces; you do not enter in yourselves, nor do you allow those who are entering to do so." In Luke's report (xi. 52) this stands last, as if it were the worst enormity of all; but no stress can be laid upon the order. A clue to the meaning is given in the expression preserved in Luke: "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge." It is knowledge, our Lord implies, which is the key of the kingdom of heaven (a hint, surely, somewhat neglected in the interpretation of Matthew xvi. 19 f., and an argument for the genuineness of that passage); and the vice here charged on the religious leaders is that of keeping the people in ignorance. To the scribes and Pharisees the multitudes were of no value; they regarded them with contempt; "this people, that knoweth not the law, are accursed" (John vii. 49). To Jesus they were the lost sheep of the house of Israel, a people perishing for lack of knowledge; and, moved with compassion, He "taught them many things." Their ignorance, in which the official leaders of religion acquiesced as the proper condition for such classes, made His heart ache; He spent His life striving to enlighten them. It is an ominous symptom in a Church when it is content to look upon the masses in darkness, when it discourages every attempt to make their share in the common heritage accessible to them, when it sets itself

to thwart upward movements, and becomes the symbol of things as they are. There is hardly an organized Church, of whatever name, which has not had to plead guilty to this charge; and there are Churches whose history for centuries might almost be summed up in one word: "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye have locked the kingdom of heaven in men's faces." Now, it belongs to the very conception of Christianity that there is nothing in it for any man which is not there for all; it is missionary and communicative, or it is worse than dead. It is here first that the word "hypocrites" is used in Matthew, for it is here that the utter dishonesty of the life denounced is unmistakable.

The next woe seems to fall upon a precisely opposite vice: instead of exclusiveness, it is proselytizing which marks the decadence of religion. "Ye compass the sea and the dry land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." This is the only time Christ speaks of proselytes, and one is amazed at His vehemence. But if we put this woe, and the one which precedes it, side by side, it is very intelligible: He is moved with indignation when He sees men who will not lift a finger for their own flesh and blood, but in defiance of God's will and the claims of humanity deliberately keep them in ignorance, spare no pains to gain a paltry addition from without to their own clique or faction. Jesus was the great Evangelist, calling men to the kingdom; but nothing was so alien to Him as the spirit of the proselytizer, recruiting adherents to gratify his vanity, or to further his ambition. The motive of the evangelist is love; the proselytizer's motive, whatever it is, lies within, not without. He cannot be disinterested; he cannot see the dimensions of the kingdom; he cannot let those whom he has won enter into its liberty and forget him. In modern language, it is nothing to him to make men Chris-

tians, unless he makes them Episcopalians or Presbyterians, Baptists or Plymouthists. But such persuasions do not come of Him who calls men : they are earthly, sensual, devilish, and the curse of Jesus rests on them. When we are told that the proselyte becomes twofold more the child of hell than the proselytizers, it means that his ruin is even surer than theirs. He has put himself into a false relation to men, which makes him more incapable than he was before of ever assuming a true relation to the truth. He is a kind of Janizary to his new faith, a more hopeless fanatic than its born adherents. The moral phenomena connected with such "conversions" are familiar enough, and intensely hateful to Christ. What is not sufficiently remarked is that they are the signs not of a religion renewing its youth, but of one in the last stages of corruption and decay.

The third indication of this same corruption is denounced by our Lord as a sophistication of the simple sense of truth. "Woe unto you, blind guides, who say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple must keep his oath." Strange things have been written by some historians of morals about the sense of truth. According to M. Renan, it is really one of the fruits of the study of physical science. Mr. Lecky holds that in the middle ages, and indeed as early as patristic times, it had been almost totally destroyed by influences proceeding from theology. "Pious frauds" were esteemed not only legitimate but praiseworthy; credulity was proclaimed a virtue by the classes most addicted to falsehood, and the revival of the sense of truth was due to the secular philosophers of the seventeenth century—men like Bacon, Descartes and Locke. As far as there is truth in this, it only proves that the Christian religion has been in the course of its history as profoundly corrupted as the Jewish. But it is absurd to

date the sense of truth from the birth of modern science or philosophy. The obligation to "speak truth to one's neighbour" is urged again and again in the Old Testament, and there is nothing more characteristic of Achilles, the moral ideal of the earliest Greek society visible to the historian, than the familiar lines: "Who dares think one thing and another tell, My heart detests him like the gates of hell." Respect for truth must ever be one of the bases of all virtue, just as contrivances to evade obligation are a root of every kind of vice. The amazing thing is that such contrivances should be elaborated and sanctioned by religion, that the very light that is in man should become darkness. It is the most flagrant of contradictions, and the men under whose auspices it is accomplished are a contradiction in themselves: they are denounced by Jesus as "blind guides." The special type of casuistry sentenced here may have originated in circumstances foreign to our time; but every society, and especially every Church, in which many profess a common creed and act as far as possible in concert, has urgent need to guard with vigilance its sense of truth. Occasions will arise in which a strong temptation will be felt to find a form of words, for instance, which will possess the maximum of formal solemnity, and the minimum of binding sanctity; and persons who must act will find it hard to resist its attraction. Ambiguity is a resource for politicians of a certain type, and politicians of a certain type may come in evil days to dominate the Church. A statement like that of Mr. Balfour (*Foundations of Belief* p. 275), that "something very different is or ought to be involved in the acceptance or rejection of common formulas than an announcement to the world of a purely speculative agreement regarding the niceties of doctrinal statement," may, no doubt, be unimpeachably innocent. But everything depends on the application made of it, and to apply it easily and freely

would probably indicate a conscience not very sensitive to the virtue of truth.

The fourth woe is pronounced upon what is popularly regarded as the essence of Pharisaism—the distortion of the moral sense, and preference of punctilios to the serious duties of life. “Ye give tithes of mint, anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith, . . . ye strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel.” This is not the vice of professionalism only, but of all who love reputation in religion. It is not clear whether the law (Deut. xiv. 22 f.; Lev. xxvii. 30) required such garden herbs as those specified to pay tithe: even if it did, the want of a sense of moral proportion betrayed in putting them before justice, mercy and good faith was a symptom that the religion expressing itself in such conduct had lost its vital force. The common moralities are always the soul of religion. The word of Jesus to the ruler retains its authority. “What shall I do to inherit eternal life? Keep the commandments. He saith unto him. Which?” As if one could have a choice of commandments. The same commandments, Jesus answers, as are given to all men—the moral law of Sinai. A religion is decadent when it does not lay the main emphasis here. It is morally blinded when it does not recognise and appreciate at its full value the moral worth even of a churchless life, which pays no tithes of mint or anise or cummin, but is marked by integrity, charity and loyalty to engagements. In a distinct and visible society the visible conventions are always intruding into the place and authority of the invisible realities; hypocrisy, as Dr. Glover puts it, deals with customs instead of character, doctrines instead of life, proprieties instead of love. It almost seems as if man had only a fixed *quantum* of moral force, which he could use, first, either on the weightier or on the more trivial matters of the law; and that to begin with the last,

as if they were the more important, is inevitably to sacrifice the first. It is the man who strains out the gnat who also swallows the camel. It is the scrupulous person who is at the same time unscrupulous. It is the punctilious who can show himself unjust, unkind, and untrue.

The next woe in Matthew's narrative is that which Luke records in connection with an entertainment in a Pharisee's house. The sin which it dooms is much akin to the one just spoken of. "Ye cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess." Jesus had repeated occasion to observe, at Pharisaic tables, the scrupulosity about Levitical cleanliness (Luke vii. 36 ff., xi. 37 ff., xiv. 1 ff.). Everywhere also He was impressed at the same time with the Pharisaic love of money, and unscrupulousness about the means of obtaining it. The whole of the sixteenth chapter of Luke is a woe upon covetousness, and especially upon Pharisaic covetousness; notice especially v. 14, which is the link between the parable of the unjust steward and that of the rich man and Lazarus. Here we have substantially the same indication of a rotten religion: men scrupulous about the purity of their cups and platters, who never ask how they were filled. To make an honest living, to fill one's cup and platter not by extortion, not by ἀκρασία, the temper which takes all it can lay hands on without regard to God or man, is an elementary religious duty. It is one for the neglect of which no regard for pious proprieties can do anything to atone. The bitterness with which men who make their living by labour have sometimes revolted against the Churches, has been due in great part to sympathy with the doctrine here taught by Jesus. It has been a kind of practical assent to His Woe! a protest against regarding as religious, on the ground of formal observances, men who filled their cup and platter by means that would not bear investigation. If the background of all these pro-

prieties is made up of oppressed servants, defrauded clients, harsh indifference to others' rights, even plundered widows' houses, it is no more than the whitewash on a grave. It is good enough to look at, but it does not remove the impurity of the grave; it only makes more hideous by contrast the rottenness within. The woe of Jesus is repeated on this particular manifestation of hypocrisy, as though it were doubly revolting to Him. Luke, indeed, with his characteristic love of charity, tells us that even here Jesus spoke of it as the antidote to the vice He was denouncing; "give for alms those things which are within (*i.e.*, the contents of the dish), and behold all things are clean unto you"; but the thought, though undoubtedly our Lord's, can hardly be right in this connection. Charity does sanctify wealth; it even does something to expiate avarice, which at least cannot be expiated without it; but it is out of place here. Jesus is exposing the corruptions of religion, not prescribing for their removal; and it is one of the most odious when a man can be scrupulously religious in all the forms, and not concerned at all as to the nature of the business by which he makes his living. Woe to the Church and the persons who are indifferent to this.

The last woe stands by itself, and seems to be quite unrelated to those which precede. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we should not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye bear witness to yourselves that ye are sons of them that murdered the prophets. Fill up then the measure of your fathers." It is plain from this that one of the most serious corruptions of religion is a wrong relation to its own past. The true religion has had a history. God has been at work in the world as far back as we can see; He has wrought, in particular, along one historical line;

His presence has been in Israel and in Christendom as it has been nowhere else; the past is full of voices possessed of religious authority. The contemporaries of Jesus were proud of their past, and devoted to it. They had canonized its religious writings, and acknowledged in them a divine authority. They held in reverence the law of Moses, and the prophets and the psalms. They canonized its saints and martyrs too, and loaded them with posthumous honours. Their fathers had killed them, but they built their tombs. With awful irony, Jesus regards this as the continuation and completion of their father's work, and bids them carry it out to the end. It will only be acting in character if they put the finishing touch to what the murderers of the prophets had been at from the beginning by murdering Him. It is evident from this that the last woe is pronounced on those who do not recognise the voice of God when it speaks out of the present. Dead prophets they can understand, but not a living prophet. That God spoke they can believe, not that God speaks; that God once interposed in human affairs, not that He interposes now. They can believe in records, in authorities, in councils, in assemblies, in fathers; not in the living God, nor in the Holy Ghost, nor in the continuance of inspiration. They canonize the dead prophets, and excommunicate or murder, as their fathers did, the living ones. It is this inability to believe in the living God which is the clearest token of the dissolution of religion. Not that a community may not survive in such disbelief; it may survive and display the most pernicious and stubborn activity; but it survives under the woe pronounced by Jesus; it survives as a conspicuous illustration of what the true religion is not.

Undoubtedly it is hard for a community to do justice both to the past and the present. The Christian Church itself was hardly born till a party appeared in it to whom men like Stephen and Saul, the true representatives of the

new era, seemed dangerous revolutionaries, casting down the tombs of the prophets, and overturning the very house of God. The situation recurs perpetually. The past claims our reverence, but God is not imprisoned in the past. There are new voices ever arising, in which He makes appeal to conscience; new glimpses are given into Christian truths, new and wider ideas of Christian duty; new aspects of the Christian ideal are presented to the mind. Woe to those who are blind to heavenly visions, because they cannot find them in the ancient fathers; to those who so glorify the past as to exclude God from speaking and acting in the present. They are the spiritual children of those who murdered the prophets and crucified the Son of God.

The long series of woes is terminated by two utterances in which we see in the heart of our Lord that same conflict of emotions which is so characteristic of the divine Spirit as revealed, for instance, in Hosea and Jeremiah. There is an inexorable sentence, and a yearning love which seems to rebel against it. Jesus looks on to the future in which the representatives of the Jewish religion are to consummate their guilt, and regards it as the fulfilment of a divine purpose. "Therefore," he says in *v.* 34—that is, in order that you may fill up the measure of your fathers—"Therefore do I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes." In St. Luke it is, "Therefore also the wisdom of God said, I will send to them prophets and apostles." This is very puzzling, but as the word "apostles" is certainly due to this evangelist, who uses it six times for once each in Matthew and Mark, it seems more likely that "the wisdom of God" (*cf.* Luke vii. 35) is also his own expression. He may have substituted it for "I," in the idea that "prophets" could only refer to the Old Testament messengers of God, and that it is the whole course of God's dealings with Israel, not what was to

follow the death of Jesus, that is in view. But however this may be, it is clear that Jesus foresaw the treatment which His messengers should receive at the hands of those who represented that decadent religion which He had denounced. Their rejection by the Jews should be the supreme guilt which made the cup run over, and brought down upon that very generation the accumulated and long-suspended judgment of heaven. Yes, on that very generation: Jesus solemnly pledges His word for it. From the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah (the first and last murder recorded in the Jewish canon, Gen. iv., 2 Chron. xxiv.), the responsibility for all innocent blood would be brought home to them.¹ Yet neither the review of their age-long iniquity, nor the sight of their religious corruption, nor the prospect of their persistent impenitence, can reconcile the heart of Jesus to leave them to their fate. He was much moved as He looked round for the last time on the city that killed the prophets and stoned them that were sent unto her. What a history, what numberless histories, are condensed in the two words, ἡθέλησα . . . οὐκ ἠθέλησατε! It is the last which is the decisive word, and with all this passion of love in His heart Jesus is compelled to go away. The solemn woes which fill this chapter, the thrilling cry with which it closes, the awful silence in which Jesus leaves the temple, are a signal illustration of His own word about the dissolution of religion: "If *the salt* have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."

JAMES DENNEY.

¹ There has been much ado about the description of Zechariah as son of Berachiah. The Zechariah who was murdered was not son of Berachiah (Luke has not the father's name at all, so that it was probably wanting in the common source), but of Jehoiada: the first evangelist probably wrote "son of Berachiah" almost unconsciously, the phrase being familiar from Zechariah i. 1. To suppose that he referred to a certain Zechariah son of Baruch who was murdered by the Zealots in the last days of Jerusalem, and that he believed Jesus to be referring prophetically to this (Weiss) is a very unnecessary expedient to explain a very simple slip.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO HIS OWN DEATH.

I.

ONE of the most remarkable facts in history is the significance which the New Testament attaches to the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. It represents Him as a Saviour who saves by the sacrifice of Himself, as "the Lamb of God," without blemish and without spot, "slain from the foundation of the world," yet offered at the end of the ages that He might redeem by His precious blood.¹ "He is our passover sacrificed for us,"² "whom God set forth as a propitiatory" (person), in order that He might "be just and the justifier of Him who is of the faith of Jesus."³ This mode of conceiving His death is so integral alike to the history and thought of the New Testament as to deserve to be described as its organic and organizing idea. And what makes the idea so remarkable is its complete singularity; it has no equivalent or counterpart in any historical religion, those religions in particular which make most of sacrifice being most remote from any such audacious conception as that their Founder is the supreme sacrificial person and His death their sole sacrifice. Thus to Israel Moses was a law-giver who commanded and threatened, exacting obedience by the hope of reward or the fear of punishment, but he was never conceived as one who "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Confucius is a sage whose authority is based on his wisdom, or his power in revealing to persons and states the secret of a happy life; but death, whether his own or another's, is too great a mystery to be understood; the wise man can only sit dumb before it. Mohammed is a prophet who denounces

¹ John i. 29; Rev. xiii. 8; 1 Peter i. 19; Heb. ix. 26.

² 1 Cor. v. 7.

³ Rom. iii. 25, 26.

hell to the disobedient and promises heaven to the faithful; but he is more distinguished by the will to inflict suffering than by the heart to endure it, even where it may bring good to others. Buddha is the nearest approach to Jesus; he makes the great renunciation, surrendering regal might and right and wealth for poverty and humiliation. For this reason his people revere him, love him, and seek to follow in his footsteps. But here the similarities are superficial, while the differences are radical. First, Buddha is a pessimist; he does not love life, for to him being is suffering, and his desire is to escape from sorrow by escaping from existence. But Jesus is never a pessimist; His very passion is the expression of a splendid optimism, the belief that being is so good that it needs only to be purged from the accident of sin to become altogether lovely, a thing to be wholly desired. Secondly, Buddha is a leader, a man to be followed and imitated; what he did men must do that they may partake of his illumination and enter into his rest. But what Jesus does no other person can do. He offers Himself a Sacrifice that He may win eternal redemption for men. Thirdly, Buddha is an Indian ascetic, whose highest work is to break up the bonds of life and all the forces which make for its continuance and for the social perfecting of the race. But Jesus is in the strict sense a Redeemer and a Sacrifice, one whose sorrow is curative, who restores our nature to personal and social health, that it may attain individual and collective happiness. His passion has thus a singular character and unique worth; it stands alone, without any parallel in the other religions of history, and it is in its ideal meaning as exalted as in its actual form and in all its circumstances it is sordid and mean. Outwardly there is nothing to distinguish it from the many thousand tragedies which describe the sufferings of inno-

cence at the hands of victorious violence, but inwardly it has been proved by the experience of man through many centuries to be the healing force of the world. Of all the conflicts of sense and spirit, this is the most curious and the most sublime.

Now, an idea at once so singular in the history of religion and so integral to the thought of the New Testament raises a double problem, first, as to its origin, and, secondly, as to its original significance. The two questions are, though quite distinct, yet so indissolubly related that they can hardly be discussed apart. Our main concern at present is with the first, though we must incidentally and illustratively touch also the second.

I. How did it happen that the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ came to be conceived as a sacrifice or atonement for human sin? Was the idea created by a real or a mythical process? Was it due to an apostolic after-thought, as it were an ingenious theory invented by imaginative men to explain an unwelcome and unexpected event? or was it an element native and necessary to the religion, as it were a primary principle of the Founder's mind?

A. The theory of a mythical and imaginative origin has of course been widely held and variously formulated. Its main lines may be stated thus: The death of Jesus was a complete surprise and disillusionment to His disciples. They had believed Him to be the victorious and immortal Messiah; they found Him to be a frail and mortal man; and in the first shock of the discovery they forsook Him and fled from their own past beliefs. But these beliefs were not so easily renounced; they had begotten hopes too precious to be abandoned even at the bidding of fate; they were endeared by affections too tender to die in the presence of disaster. And so while experience tempted to acquiescence in the accomplished, which was but the end that

Nature has in store for all, the imagination and the heart pleaded for another and more splendid issue. If the death was not to extinguish Jesus, He must transfigure the death, and change it into something quite other than the lot common to mortal men. This was the supreme achievement and victory of faith; it could not cease to regard Jesus as the Messiah, but it could do a sublimer thing—invest His death with eternal significance. The vision that created the belief in the resurrection made the transfiguration of the death more possible; yet the one was a harder and tardier process than the other. All at once, as is the way of visions, the resurrection became a credited fact, which the visionaries on every possible occasion affirmed they themselves had witnessed, but the death had an inexplicable, accidental, violent character. The one was God's action, the other was man's. God had raised Him from the dead, but it was by wicked hands that He had been "taken, crucified, and slain."¹ The Jews had "killed the Prince of Life," demanding His death even when Pilate "was determined to let Him go."² But this crude theory could not long endure, for if "wicked hands" could prevail once, why not again and finally? So a second stage is marked by the acceptance of the customary Jewish explanation of the detested inevitable—it was the Will of God. While Herod and Pontius Pilate, the people of Rome and of Israel had appeared to act, the real Actor had been God; they only did what the hand and counsel of God had determined before to be done.³ But this position had too little reason in it to satisfy the imaginative intellect of the young society. It read with new eyes the Old Testament, found that Isaiah's servant of God was a sufferer for human sin, and all his attributes and experiences were forthwith ascribed to Jesus.⁴ As this sufferer was "led like a lamb to

¹ Acts i. 23.² *Ib.* iii. 13-15.³ *Ib.* iv. 27, 28.⁴ *Ib.* viii. 30-35.

the slaughter," so Jesus became "the Lamb of God," with all the sacrificial ideas of Judaism aggregated round His person and His death. The process once begun, needed for its completion only a constructive genius, and instead of one such, three soon appeared: Paul, who argued that the death was both the fulfilment and the abolition of the law; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who made Jesus and His sufferings the antitype which had its type in the elaborate ritual and worship of the old economy; and John, who found in the person, history, and death of our Lord the means by which the world was illumined and redeemed. And so by a perfectly natural, yet purely mythical and imaginative process, the death was transfigured from the last calamity of a blameless life to the act of grace by which God saved the world.

B. But this theory, however ingeniously plausible, has three great defects: it lacks proof, it is intrinsically improbable, and it fails to explain the facts. Its proofs are drawn from sources which its advocates have in other connexions, and for what they deemed adequate reasons, discredited. It is not open to the same criticism to prove by analysis at one time the early speeches in the Acts to be late compositions, and at another to use them as authentic evidence for the oldest Christian beliefs. And here the most primitive tradition is specially explicit. The gospel which Paul received and preached, and affirmed to be that which saved, was—"Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures."¹ And this can only mean that at the moment of his conversion the belief had been not simply formulated, but elaborated into a system in harmony with the Old Testament. Then, as to the intrinsic improbabilities, we have to consider both the men and the theory; it was a belief of stupendous originality; they were persons of no

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3.

intellectual attainments and small inventive faculty. So far as the Gospels enable us to judge, they were curiously deficient in imagination, and of timid understanding. They were remarkable for their inability to draw obvious conclusions, to transcend the commonplace, and comprehend the unfamiliar, or find a rational reason for the extraordinary. Such men might dream dreams and see visions, but to invent an absolutely novel intellectual conception as to their Master's person and death—a conception that changed man's view of God, of sin, of humanity, of history, in a word, of all things Divine and human—was surely a feat beyond them. And the improbabilities involve the inadequacy of the theory; it makes Christ, with all He has accomplished, the creation of accident, and leaves us without any sufficient reason for the being of the beliefs and the religion which have so governed the course of history. In physical science the only thing that can be named a cause is one equal to the production of all the effects; and as here the total effect is the part played by Christianity in the history of man, we feel bound to say that nothing can be a cause less adequate to its production than the mythopœic faculty of a few illiterate men.

II. But now let us change the point of view, and see whether we can better explain the rise and nature of the idea through the mind of Jesus Himself than through the reminiscent phantasies of His disciples. If the idea be His, it must be regarded as a real and integral part of His religion, while a comparison of the forms He gives it with the forms it assumes in their hands ought to have some significance for theology, were it only as helping to define the place and function of the subjective factor in doctrine. Wendt, for example, holds that the Apostle Paul, in particular, "remodelled" Christ's idea, and so gave to His sacrificial death a special significance for the forgiveness of sins, "this being a reference nowhere made by Jesus Him-

self."¹ Whether this be so we must now attempt to determine.

A. It is important to note at the outset that the mind of Jesus may be described as in this matter simpler than the apostolic mind, but His emotions as much more complex. His thinking runs less into distinction and detail, but His feeling is richer, deeper, and more varied. Conflicting emotions agitate Him—now exalt and now depress Him. He sees the necessity of His death, and does not seek to escape from it, but from the forces which work it and the form in which it comes He shrinks with horror and alarm. He perceives its functions and issues, and He rejoices to give His life a ransom for many, but, as His life is taken as well as given, He suffers agony because of those who take it even while He feels in the act of surrender joy at doing His Father's will. As a result, those elements of the sacrifice and death which appear as the first and most essential to us appeared as the last and most incidental to Him. What this difference signifies we shall be the better able to appreciate if we first attempt to come to the death as He came to it, and then attempt to construe it, as it seemed to the Apostles, in the light of His words and His experience.

We frankly recognise that the idea distinctly emerges in the teaching of Jesus only at a comparatively late period, and we may reasonably infer that what is not explicit in His speech was not clear to His mind. The idea embodied in Holman Hunt's "The Shadow of the Cross" is false to nature and to history, for Christ's was too fine a spirit to make out of its own sorrow a shade in which those who looked to Him for love should sit cold and fearful; and we may reasonably infer that before the evil days came His customary mood would be the exaltation born of the splendid ideal He was to realize. The morning of His

¹ *The Teaching of Jesus*, vol. ii., pp. 239 ff.

ministry was a golden dawn; in His early parables the sunny side of life so greets us that we may almost see the smile upon His face answering the smile upon the face of Nature. The birds of the air had sung in His ear their songs of faith and hope. The lily of the field had unfolded to His eye a beauty which made the glory of Solomon seem tawdry pomp. He had communed with Nature until she became the presence of God, speaking to Him of the Father He loved and in whom He lived. He had watched the farmer following the plough, casting abroad the seed, putting in the sickle when the corn was fully ripe, storing the grain till his barns were bursting. He loved to walk through the cornfields, to look at the vines and the vine-dressers, to observe the fig tree, to study the shadows and the sunshine that flitted across the face of the lake. He who had so brooded over Nature must have had the happiness of the quiet eye, the placid soul which is ever born of the fellowship of the invisible in us with the invisible without us through the medium of what is visible in both. And so there is no person who could less be described as "the Man of Sorrows" than the Jesus of the earlier ministry. His spirit is bright, His words are serious without being sad, weighted with the ideas of God, and duty, and humanity, but not burdened with the agony or wet as with the sweat of blood.

Yet even then He had thoughts that prophesied the passion. They were native to Him, not given or forced upon Him from without. Experience was indeed to Him, as to us, a teacher; and as He "learned obedience by the things which He suffered," so, apart from the same things, He could not have known His meaning and His mission. But these were conditions rather than sources of knowledge. The notion of a suffering Messiah filled a small place, if, indeed, it filled any place at all, in contemporary Jewish thought, but He could not study ancient prophecy

without finding such a Messiah there. History showed that the very people who built the sepulchres of the dead prophets had refused to hear or even to endure them while they lived; and John the Baptist, slain by a foolish king to gratify the malice of a wicked woman, stood before Him as evidence of continuity in history. And as He preached the Kingdom He found that those who seemed or claimed to be its constituted guardians were His most inveterate foes, the scribe waited to catch Him in His talk, the Pharisee watched to charge His good with being evil, the priests resisted Him in the temple, which they had made into a mart for merchandise. Opposition confronted Him at every moment and in every point; His idea of God's righteousness as distinguished from the law's was made to appear a grave heresy; His friendship for sinners was represented as affection for sin; His very acts of beneficence were explained as works of the devil, and His doctrine of the kingdom handled as if it signified a reign of lawlessness. Such experiences could create only one feeling, that the enmity His ministry encountered must ultimately fall upon His person; and as He could not surrender His mission He must be prepared to surrender His life. This was a conclusion it needed no inspiration to draw; all it needed was an intelligence able to measure the moral forces opposed, and to calculate the moment when those who were determined not to suffer public defeat would make material force the final arbiter of the dispute.

B. This line of thought may show that there was nothing extraordinary or supernatural in Jesus' foreknowledge of His own death. His prophecy was but the expression of a mind which knew that it could not cease to be obedient while His enemies would not cease to be hostile. And their hostility could have only one end. But though His experience might thus explain how He came to anticipate the fact and even the manner of His death, it does not

explain the only thing worthy of explanation, viz., how He came to give it special significance. For this we must turn to His own teaching. One of the earliest things recorded of Him is His saying to the sick of the palsy, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."¹ This is characteristic; His mission is not to the righteous, but to the sinner; and how this mission was to be fulfilled was made manifest, even before the ministry began, by the temptation. He was tempted, first, to make Himself independent of Nature and different from man by the use of supernatural power on His own behalf; secondly, to claim such special guardianship from God as would place Him above death; and thirdly, to employ such external and physical means for the attainment of His ends as would have conveyed into His new kingdom the methods of the kingdoms of the world. Hence by the rejection of these alternatives He affirms, first, that His obedience must be of the completest kind; secondly, that He accepts all the fatalities of our common lot, including the liability to suffering and death; and thirdly, that He is to accomplish His purpose by spiritual and personal action. And the principles that guided Him appeared in His earliest teaching. The qualities praised in the beatitudes He exemplified,—He Himself, as above all others persecuted for righteousness' sake, was to be above all others blessed. He had come to fulfil the law and the prophets by realizing their essence, the righteousness, the service, the sacrifice which avails before God. He substitutes self-abnegation for retaliation; the love of our neighbour, with all its obligations, He expands into love of man. The deeds we do are to be done in behalf of the evil as well as the good. And the laws of the kingdom are binding both upon His disciples and Himself. While they are so dear to the Father that even the hairs of their head are all numbered, yet they "shall be hated of all men for His name's sake."

¹ Mark ii. 5. Cf. Luke vii. 47-50.

But they are not to count their lives dear unto themselves ; they are to take up the cross and follow Him. He that findeth his life shall lose it, he who loseth his life for the gospel's sake shall find it.¹ His work is one, therefore, which involves suffering even unto death. His destiny is to Himself so little peaceful that He seems to conceive it as a baptism of fire, and He feels straitened till it be accomplished.² By the loss of His life He is to fulfil His mission.

C. But from the implicit we must now advance to the explicit teaching of Jesus concerning His death. It first becomes distinct after the confession of Peter,³ and before we attempt to understand His words some preliminary remarks must be made. (i.) The reserve or even reticence touching Himself which He maintains in the Synoptics. He is clear and emphatic enough when He speaks to His disciples of God, or the kingdom or its laws, but concerning Himself He speaks not so much in parables as darkly, suggestively. He appears to have desired that their conception of Him should be of their own forming rather than of His communicating, a belief reached through the exercise of reason, not simply received on His authority. His method was to proceed through familiarity to supremacy, not through sovereignty to subservience. If the discipleship had been formed on the basis of His divine pre-eminence, it would have had no reality, He would never have got near the men, the men would never have come near to Him ; aloofness would have marked His way and they would have walked as if divided by an impassable gulf from Him. And so it was as Jesus of Nazareth that He called them, He a man of whom they could learn, they men who could learn of Him. And He forced nothing, stimulated but did not supersede the action of their own minds ; and when He asked His great question, " Whom say ye that I am ? " it was as if

¹ Matt. x. 38, 39.

² Luke xii. 50.

³ Mark viii. 31-33 ; Matt. xvi. 21-23 ; Luke ix. 21, 22.

He had inquired, "What conclusion have you as reasonable men been compelled to draw from the things which you have seen and heard?" (ii.) This method of Jesus explains two things: (a) the relative lateness of the period at which the confession is made. It was the issue of a lengthened process in slow and simple minds, and to have hurried the process would have been to spoil the issue. (β) The immediate and consequent emergence of the new teaching, for only now could the disciples begin to understand the meaning and the need of the death; and unless they were made now to understand it, the Messiahship they confessed would turn into a counterfeit of the truth.

Now, all these points are cardinal for the interpretation of this passage. The teaching becomes explicit because the disciples were now beginning to be able to understand it. Not till they knew who the person was could they conceive the thing He had come to do. Thus the death He speaks of is not the death of the person called Jesus, but of the Christ, the Messiah for whom Israel had existed, into whom his whole meaning was gathered, through whom he was to be saved. Nor is it without significance that Mark and Luke retain the formula, "the Son of Man," as denoting Him who is to suffer and be slain. The act is on the passive side not merely personal, but official, concerns mankind as well as Israel. Then correspondent to the denomination of the victim are the titles of those who are to do the deed. "The elders, chief priests, and scribes" are named in all the three narratives, and the meaning of this can hardly be mistaken. The names are representative, symbols of collective Israel acting in a solemn and ceremonial manner. "The elders" are Israel as a State, the "chief priests" are Israel as a Church, the "scribes" are Israel as the people of the Book, possessed of "the oracles of God." When they are conceived as acting together, the action is conceived as all Israel's,

a civil, sacerdotal, and religious body corporate. These contrasted titles then—the Christ on the one hand, and “the elders, chief priests, and scribes” on the other, can only mean one thing, that the acts in which they were to be respectively engaged, bearing and causing suffering, enduring and inflicting death, have a more than mere personal significance; they realize the ends for which the Messiah stood by means of the ideas for which Israel was the symbol; *i.e.*, Jesus conceives His death as in form a sacrifice, a medium for the reconciliation of Man to God, though a sacrifice may have been the last thing it was intended to be by the men who effected it. And the rebuke to Peter shows how necessary Jesus thought this view of His death to be. His words are remarkable: “Get thee behind me, Satan! for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.” It is hardly possible to avoid the inference that there is here a reminiscence of the temptation. Jesus feels as if the tempter were once more showing Him all the kingdoms of the world.¹ Peter’s idea had been before presented, resisted, and cast out; and the disciples must now begin to learn what the Master had known from the first, that He was born for sacrifice and must bear the cross.

The interpretation of these synoptic passages receives interesting illustration and confirmation from the verse in John: “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”² Here the emphasis falls upon “*this* temple,” *i.e.*, as John explains, “the temple of His body,” the flesh which had become the tabernacle of the Word.³ The meaning is evident: His person is the new temple, where God meets man and man God, where all sacrifices are consummated by the eternal sacrifice which He performed, and all priesthoods are ended by the coming of the Eternal Priest. All the ideas which stood in symbol in the old

¹ Matt. iv. 10.² *Ib.* ii. 19.³ *Ib.* i. 14.

temple were in the new turned into the reality which abideth. Nothing was so fit as that the imperfect should pass when the perfect had come, and that its passing should be marked by the act in which "the elders, the chief priests, and scribes" took so fateful a part.

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

(*To be continued.*)

THE RIVERS OF DAMASCUS:

ABANA AND PHARPAR.

(2 KINGS v. 12.)

THESE rivers are mentioned once, and only once, in the Bible. They are set in a heroic story as perennial in idyllic charm as their own cooling waters.

We owe the record of these names to a patriotic outburst of passion on the part of Naaman, "captain of the host of the King of Syria." This renowned general is described in the narrative as "a great man with his master and honourable, because by him the Lord had given victory unto Syria"; and it is added with pathetic antithesis, "He was also a mighty man of valour, but he was a leper."

Naaman must have been a man of transcendent genius to become the leader of the armies of Benhadad, notwithstanding the disadvantages of a loathsome disease that doomed its victims to a living death, and cut them off from all social intercourse with healthy men and women. He must also have diffused around him some of the graciousness that his name implies, for his memory is still green in the local tradition of Damascus, while the names of other great Damascene warriors are buried in oblivion. It might be said that Naaman takes rank in Damascus tradition immediately after Abraham, "the good Ibrahim."

There is outside the walls of Damascus a large edifice,

called *The House of Naaman*, devoted to lepers. The late Sir Richard Burton and I made a careful examination of the structure, and we came to the conclusion that it had been a Byzantine church, and that it probably stood on the site of the real *Beit Naaman*.

In one of their border forays the Syrian raiders had brought back to Damascus, with other spoils, a young Jewish girl, and she, in the distribution of the booty, had fallen to Naaman, and become his wife's slave. This Jewish maiden, amid the luxurious splendours of Damascus, did not forget the rugged land of the prophets, and, although the horror of flashing spears and flowing blood, and the red light of her father's blazing roof, were ever present, she had compassion on her captor, and at her suggestion it was arranged that the leper should seek cleansing from the lowly prophet of her people.

The great captain, commended by a letter from his royal master, proceeded in state to the King of Israel. He bore with him Damascus robes—gifts acceptable to sheikhs and princelings still—and much silver and gold; but the splendid embassy, with their royal gifts, only alarmed the King of Israel, and the gorgeous leper turned away from the palace of the monarch, and proceeded with his horses and his chariots to the hut of the prophet.

Elisha, undazzled by the splendour of the illustrious men that waited at his door, and regardless of their gifts, sent a simple message to the leper to go and wash seven times in Jordan and be clean.

Naaman was perhaps the most heroic figure in that heroic age. He was used to command and wont to be obeyed. The hosts of Benhadad moved at his will, and he had a swift way of settling controversies with the rivals of Syria. He had come to Samaria a suppliant, but his rank and his gifts were, he considered, sufficient to command any favour within the resources of Israel. The King of

Israel, however, would not, or could not, give him the relief he sought, and the prophet declined even to rise from his seat to speak to the great man at his door, but sent him, in defiance of Oriental etiquette, a verbal message to wash in an Israelitish river. Naaman, stung by this crowning affront, which was both personal and political, exclaimed, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?"

In the light of these remarks, we now ask what were the rivers referred to by Naaman? Where are we now to look for the Abana and Pharpar?

When we turn to Greek times, we find the Damascus water called *the Chrysorrhoeas*, the gold-flowing. The main stream is now known as *the Barada*, the cold. These names do not help us much in our quest, and we have to fall back on the exclamation of the leper, the topography and names of the rivers themselves, and local tradition.

From the words of Naaman we are assured of two things:—

I. The Abana and Pharpar were "the rivers of Damascus," and not merely "rivers of Damascus," as the translation runs in the Authorised Version.

II. They were for ablutionary uses, the chief consideration in the mind of the Damascene addressing Damascenes, superior to the Jordan and all other Palestinian rivers.

We may assume that Benhadad's great general and those who surrounded him were men not only of experience in war, but of intelligence regarding practical matters, and that, notwithstanding the tendency and temptation to magnify everything Damascene, their words were true in substance and in fact. Naaman, though stung by an affront that was both contemptuous, and humiliating, would not have hazarded a general assertion at variance with the common experience of his followers, even to the lowest

groom in the cavalcade. Taking, then, Naaman's exclamation as fairly correct, we may hopefully examine the rivers of Damascus with a view to the reasonable identification of the two to which he referred.

My chief qualification for this investigation arises from the circumstances that I resided eight or nine years by the banks of the rivers of Damascus, and traced, without stepping beyond my duty, every stream to its fountain, and followed every affluent throughout its entire course. There is scarcely a bright pool in the whole range of the rivers in which I have not bathed, or a muddy fen in which I have not shot ducks and woodcocks, or startled pigs and hyenas. I believe I had a practical acquaintance with the rivers as complete as that of Naaman himself, or perhaps of any one else since or before his time. I had also a very thorough acquaintance with the descendants of the men who dwelt by the banks of the Abana and Pharpar in the days of Benhadad. Kings and great men pass away, dynasties are overthrown, and armies carried into captivity, but the *fellahin* of a land have their roots in the soil, and Ibrahim follows Ibrahim in Syria, as Jacque follows Jacque in France, through all the whirlwinds of revolution. The language and traditions of a bookless people, where father tells son what he saw, should not be overlooked by those who would throw light on the hidden things of the past.

The rivers of Damascus do not receive their water from tributary streams, like our rivers, but from two great fountains—'Ain Barada and 'Ain Fijeh.

'Ain Barada, the higher of these fountains, rises in the beautiful plain of Zebedâny, a little over twenty miles from Damascus, on the way to Baalbek. The plain, which is over 3,000 feet above the level of the sea, is surrounded and shut in by lofty mountains, some of which rise to an altitude of 7,000 feet.

At the south-west side of the plain, near the base of one of the mountains, the 'Ain Barada bubbles up from the level ground, and forms a marshy lake 300 yards long by 50 broad. A few yards from the upper edge of the fountain the ground is perfectly dry, and gives no indication of an underground river. The sedgy surface of the lake is tenanted by waterfowl.

There are small fountains higher up on the way to Baalbek at 'Ain Hawar, Bludân, and Zebedâny, but their waters are exhausted in irrigating gardens and fields before they reach the main stream of 'Ain Barada, and they can scarcely be said to contribute to the rivers of Damascus, though they are within the same watershed.

From the little lake the river flows gently between grassy banks, with only a fall of seventy feet till it reaches a Roman bridge, where it tumbles down a beautiful cascade, and foams and roars through the ruins of Abila of Lysanias (Luke iii. 1) between frowning cliffs, which are honey-combed with ancient rock-hewn tombs. On a hill to the south-west stands the tomb of Abel, which gave its name to the city, the ruins of which are in the bend of the river below. Having washed the crumbling remains of the ancient capital of Abilene, the river rushes between precipitous banks till it reaches its sacred and most important source, Fijeh.

The fountain Fijeh, so called probably from *πηγή*, fountain, issues from under the massive ruins of a temple, at the base of a mountain. Clear as crystal, and cold as ice, the river leaps from the sun-scorched mountain, and darts swiftly in a torrent, about 30 feet wide, and 3 feet deep, a distance of 70 or 80 yards, till it joins the Barada.

Reinforced by a volume of water more than two-thirds greater than its own, the enlarged river cuts a deep channel among the roots of the hills, and through the flinty Sahara, until it breaks through the last ridge of "Lebanon towards

the sun rising," and spreads fan-like through the city and gardens of Damascus.

As the Barada nears and enters the city, seven canals are drawn off from the main river at various altitudes, and flow by thousands of channels which carry their wealth of water to every shady garden and thirsty field, and sparkle in the marble fountains of a thousand court-yards. These waters are the life and glory of Damascus.

With the rivers spread out like a fan before us, we may determine at a glance which were the Abana and Pharpar.

There is a curious tendency on the part of great cities to develop residential west end suburbs, and Damascus in its palmy days fell under the natural law. Excavations show by the foundations of mansions, and by extensive underground water-courses, that the abodes of the rich and luxurious extended on each side of the central river far beyond the limits of the present city. There are also indications that even in Mohammedan times the wealth and prosperity of the city overflowed in the same natural trend.

These two western suburbs of Damascus were watered by two distinct rivers. The Abanias, a river drawn off on the right side of the main stream, flowed through the residential suburb that spread along the southern bank of the Barada. In the name Abanias we have the long sought-for name, Abana.

The Taura, drawn off from the left side of the main stream, flowed through the residential north-west end suburb. Above the Taura there is a more important river, but it flows along nearer the base of the mountain that overhangs Damascus, and waters an important agricultural district, beyond where stood the luxurious west end.

The Taura ought to be the Pharpar. It watered the north-western suburb, as the Abanias (Abana) watered the south-western suburb. Naaman and his rich friends lived in those luxurious and healthy suburbs, and they knew the

virtues of those two rivers. The bath is an oriental institution borrowed by the West. In the days of Benhadad at Damascus, as in the time of Juvenal at Rome, it was used for luxury as much as for cleansing, and Naaman spoke of the crystal waters that flowed through his court, and had so often refreshed him in his marble bath when he returned weary and dust-stained from his campaigns.

The conjecture that the Taura is the Pharpar does not stand unsupported. In the ancient version of the Arabic Bible, translated by Rabbi Saadiah, published at Constantinople in 1545, and reproduced in the Paris and London Polyglots, the names Abana and Pharpar are rendered Abana and Taura. The translation was made long before it was published, and the translator doubtless gave Scripture currency to the tradition of his time.

When I reached Damascus, I met Dr. Meshaka. He was by far the most learned man in Damascus, or in Syria, and he knew all the traditions of the place. I asked which of the seven rivers were the Abana and Pharpar, and he promptly replied, "The Abanias and Taura." I reminded him that the 'Awaj (the Crooked) had been identified with the Pharpar. He said, smiling, "That is a foreign identification. No Damascene could have made that mistake, for the 'Awaj is not a river of Damascus at all. It is distant three hours from the city at its nearest part, and it flows beyond the *Jebel el Aswad* (the Black Mountain), which shuts it out even from the plain of Damascus." The local tradition thus combines with the fitness of things in marking the Abanias and Taura as the rivers referred to by Naaman.

Those who identified the 'Awaj with the Pharpar were influenced by the consideration that the 'Awaj is an independent river, while the Pharpar is only a canal drawn off from a river. But this is also a mistake which could not have been made by a Damascene. Each of the canals

drawn off from the main river is called a *Nakr*, or river. There was another reason for identifying the 'Awaj with the Pharpar. The 'Awaj was supposed to issue from a Wady Barbar, a name which seemed to retain an echo of the word Pharpar. This theory was investigated by Burton and Drake, and found to be baseless. A *Jebel Barbar* was discovered, but no Wady of the name.

Nor could any one acquainted with the 'Awaj have ever supposed it was one of the Damascus rivers referred to by Naaman. It descends from Mount Hermon, and throughout its whole highland course is muddy with clay and sand. I once tried to bathe in a quiet part of the stream, and I came out as white as Naaman himself. In the lower reaches of the river it flows sluggishly between mud banks and swarms with toads, frogs, and leeches. I once, and only once, attempted a bath in the lower 'Awaj. During the winter torrents it is swollen to the dimensions of a river; but under no circumstances could Naaman have lauded the 'Awaj over the Jordan in the presence of his least intelligent follower. Between the 'Awaj, a mountain burn, and the Great Jordan there is no room for comparison. And although the patriotism, pride, and prejudice of the great general were roused, he could not have been guilty of the folly of comparing the 'Awaj with the Jordan.

On the other hand, the charms of the Abana and Pharpar for purposes of luxury and comfort are so much superior to those of the muddy Jordan, that every Damascene in the days of Benhadad, and even under the rule of the Turk, would join in the patriotic boast, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" The love of even the decadent Damascene for his cool and flashing rivers is one of his strongest passions.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

THE APOSTOLIC CONFERENCE AT JERUSALEM :

A STUDY IN CHRONOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

GREAT importance is attached by Prof. Ramsay to the synchronisms between the Acts and the Galatian Epistle with reference to the early visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem. The result of these synchronisms is to exclude from the epistle all reference to the apostolic conference, and to identify the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with the visit recorded in Acts xi. 29, 30, xii. 25 in connection with the Antiochian collection for the famine-stricken poor at Jerusalem. Dr. Sanday is not convinced by his argument; and there is reason to think that undue emphasis is laid upon the concluding sentence on the poor of Jerusalem.

It is the purpose of this paper to examine the question in the light of critical analysis, taking for a guide in this extremely dangerous path the results attained by one of the latest critics, Johannes Jüngst, in his *Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*.

We fear that we shall not convince Prof. Ramsay by such a line of argument, as he has what may be termed a wholesome opinion as to the extravagance of the methods pursued by analytical criticism. It is sufficient to say that Herr Jüngst is not amongst the most extravagant, and his careful work may at least claim a hearing by one who allows, with regard to the first four chapters of the Acts, "that at least two accounts by two different authorities underlie Luke's narrative."¹

Jüngst sees two sources only in the Acts: one, the interest of which centres in Jerusalem, which he calls B; another whose interest is in the missionary expansion of the Church, called A. The Jerusalem document (B) does not extend

¹ Ramsay's *St. Paul*, p. 366.

beyond chapter xv. ; the Gentile document with which the book opens, and which is used in these earlier chapters, becomes the sole source from chapter xvi.

The materials of the Jerusalem source have become transposed in the composition of the Acts, and it is this transposition and dislocation which needs attention in the chronological view of the early visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem.

It is not possible here to do more than give the sequence of events in the earlier chapters as they have been worked out by Jüngst.

The Jerusalem source opens with the filling in of the apostolic body (i. 15-26) ; it records the gathering of the nations on the day of Pentecost (ii. 1, 5-11), and the speech of St. Peter (ii. 24-31, 34, 35) ; the unity of the 3,000 in the fellowship of the apostles (ii. 41b-42) ; the Sadducean persecution (v. 17-25, 34-40) ; the conversion of priests to the new faith (vi. 7) ; the works and wonders wrought by the hand of the disciples (v. 12, 15, 16) ; the gifts of the rich to the common fund (ii. 45 ; iv. 36, 37) ; the judgment on Ananias and Sapphira (v. 1-11) ; the appointment of the Seven (vi. 1-6) ; the charge against St. Stephen (vi. 8, 11, 15), his apology and martyrdom (vii. 22-28, 35-43, 51-58) ; Saul's persecution of the Church (viii. 1a, 3), and his conversion (ix. 6-20) ; the reconciliation of Saul with the apostles (ix. 26-28) ; the persecution under Herod Agrippa, and his death (xii. 1-23) ; the missions of St. Peter (ix. 32-x. 48), and of St. Philip (viii. 5-40) ; St. Peter's defence before the apostles at the conference (xi. 1-15, xv. 13-20) ; the peace of the Church (ix. 31).

The year 44 is the important landmark in this record, the death of Herod Agrippa I. The civil persecution recorded in connection with it belongs to his last years ; and it leads to the spread of missionary activity in the following years. This activity opens up the question of the status of

the Gentiles in the Christian Church, and leads to the apostolic conference at Jerusalem. It would be a question of such large importance that delay in it would be ill-advised after the action of St. Peter at Cæsarea. If 42-44 may be taken as the date of the Herodian persecution, and 45-46 for the missions of St. Peter and St. Philip, the conference in this record will fall in the winter of 46-47.

No mention is made of St. Paul in connection with this conference, the event being associated with other missions. The record only contains the formal notice of one visit to Jerusalem, when St. Paul went up after his conversion, and was reconciled with the apostles. If 33 be accepted as the date of the conversion, and 33-36 allowed for his work in Arabia and Damascus, this visit would be assigned to the winter of 36-37.

The Gentile source opens with the charge of the Risen Lord (i. 6-8); it records the meeting in the upper room (i. 12-14); the gift of tongues (ii. 4), and the speech of St. Peter (ii. 12-23, 32, 33); the baptism of the faithful (ii. 41*a*); the joy of common life (ii. 46, 47); the acts of St. Peter and St. John (iii. 11-iv. 31); the unity of the faithful (iv. 32, 33); St. Stephen before the council (vi. 9, 10, 12-14); his defence and martyrdom (vii. 1-21, 29-34, 44-50, 58*b*-60); the persecution of the Church (viii. 1*b*); the conversion of Saul (ix. 1-5, 22-25); the mission of St. Barnabas to Antioch (xi. 19-23, 25, 26), and the apostolic conference at Jerusalem (xv. 1-4, 30, 32-35); the Galatian journey of Barnabas and Saul (xiii., xiv.), and their return to Antioch (xiv. 25-28); the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (xi. 27-30; xii. 25), and their separation (xv. 36-41) on their return to Antioch.

The long gap in the record between the conversion of St. Paul and the mission of St. Barnabas to Antioch is explained by the purpose of the document, the development of the mission work in the world. The gap represents the

years of work probably carried on by St. Paul between his visit to Jerusalem in 36-37, and the mission of St. Barnabas in the years 45-46. There is nothing definite to date this mission, but it is associated with the other missions of St. Peter and St. Philip in the general order of St. Luke. The gap corresponds with the "ten years of quiet work" recognised by Professor Ramsay in his chronology.¹ No mention is made of St. Paul's earlier visit to Jerusalem; but the visit on the occasion of the conference occupies a prominent place in the fellow work of the two Gentile apostles. In the analysis of Jüngst it occupies the same position as in the Jerusalem record, immediately after, and as the result of the early mission activity of the Church of Jerusalem. The conference was a necessary step towards the further development of that work represented by the Galatian journey. If we accept the date 47-49 for this journey, the second visit of the Gentile record, the visit subsequent, therefore, to the conference, must be placed in the winter of 49-50.

The argument used by Jüngst must be briefly noticed.

The opening verses (xv. 1-4) give the Pauline version of the conference as contained in the Gentile source. Certain Judaistic teachers go down to Antioch, and stir up strife by saying that circumcision, according to the law of Moses, is necessary to salvation. The Pauline teaching that the formal recognition of circumcision necessarily involves the fulfilling of the whole law, and is therefore inconsistent with the liberty of the Gospel, is thus attacked. Barnabas and Saul, in consequence of the strife stirred up by these teachers, go up to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles and elders. They are sent by authority of the Church; they pass through Phœnice and Samaria, announcing the conversion of the heathen; and they are formally received by the Church at Jerusalem, the apostles and elders being

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 47.

specially mentioned as present at the conference. The details are absent, or only perhaps faintly traceable in the following narrative. The sequel is contained in xv. 30a, 32-35, in which verses the return of the apostles to Antioch, the return of Judas and Silas to Jerusalem, and the activity of Barnabas and Saul at Antioch, are recorded. This is, according to Jüngst, the sum of the Gentile source on the conference.

The only portion of the narrative which he assigns to the Jerusalem source is the speech of St. James (xv. 13b-19a, 20), which he places between the speech of St. Peter xi. 1-17, and the conclusion of the record (ix. 31). He thus ascribes it to the conference on the matter of St. Peter's mission to Cæsarea. The Noachian precepts in this connection would have a special reference to the case of the Gentiles of Cæsarea, the "strangers in the land" (Lev. xvii. 12; xviii. 26).

The rest of the narrative (xv. 5-13a, 19b, 21-29, 30b-31) is given by him to the redactor. Amongst other considerations leading to this conclusion is the different point of view of the ground assigned for the acceptance of the Gentiles in xv. 9b, compared with that in chapters x., xi. The cleansing by faith is an advance on the abolition of the distinction between the clean and the unclean in the earlier narrative. The style of the letter appears to him similar to that of the prologue of St. Luke's Gospel; and the letter refers to Syria and Cilicia, the districts named in the Gentile source A, the Noachian precepts originally passed, according to the Jerusalem source B, with reference to the district of Cæsarea.

It is not necessary to follow Jüngst through every detail in his analysis; this may be done by reference to his work.¹ He allows that the redactor was making use of written sources, because of the mention of Judas, called Barsabbas,

¹ *Quellengeschichte*, pp. 134-144.

and Silas. Had the names occurred in B, the Jerusalem source, the mission of the two would have been Cæsarea and not Antioch. Moreover, this record has already made mention of a Barsabbas, the Joses Barsabbas, surnamed Justus (i. 23) whom, with Ewald, he identifies with the Barsabbas of xv. 22. The difference of the names Joses and Judas points to the difference of source.

The dislocation of the materials brought about in the compilation of the Acts calls for some note. The narrative of chapter xv. is not in the chronological order that it occupied in the original Gentile source on which it is based. The key to the solution of the difficulty and to its recognition is found in the contradiction in the best texts between xv. 32-33 and xv. 40. This is met in C, D, and some other codices by the insertion: "But it seemed good unto Silas to abide there"; and in D by a further interpolation: "And Judas alone went away." The close juxtaposition of the visit of Silas to Antioch after the conference in A.D. 47, and his presence at Antioch on the eve of the second journey in 50, caused by the transposition of the original sources, led both to the apparent contradiction and the attempt made to explain it.

Another argument in favour of this transposition Jüngst finds in the reference to Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia in xv. 23. This presupposes that in the Gentile source the mission field of Barnabas and Saul had been those districts alone, and not the Galatian country implied by the present order of the narrative. Chapter xv. should precede chapters xiii., xiv.

Another argument may be mentioned, though it is not so clear and strong as these two. St. Barnabas had been sent to Antioch in consequence of the report which had reached the Church of Jerusalem. It is reasonable to suppose that St. Barnabas on his return to Jerusalem would bring up his report as to the conditions and progress of the work. No

such report is alluded to in the record of the visit in xi. 30 ; xii. 25. The argument from silence is a dangerous one, especially in view of the long insertion of the Herodian persecution. But this does not, in Jüngst's opinion, justify the omission, and he sees a reference to this report in the statement of xv. 4: "They rehearsed all things that God had done with them."

To restore the order of the Gentile source it is only requisite to transpose xv. 1-35 and xi. 27-30, xii. 25. The various contradictions then disappear. Judas Barsabbas and Silas, according to xv. 32-33, return to Jerusalem. The sudden appearance of Silas in Antioch (xv. 40) is not more surprising than that of Mark in xv. 37. Syria and Cilicia had been the only sphere of mission labour, and therefore are the only district referred to in xv. 23. The work could be called "the conversion of the Gentiles" (xv. 3). The report of xv. 4 was brought up after the whole year's intercourse and fellow work at Antioch (xi. 26), to which period also belongs the visit of the Judaisers (xv. 1). The record of the gathering of the Church in Antioch (xiii. 1) follows naturally upon the ministry of xv. 35, "Paul and Barnabas tarried in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also." The brief record (xi. 27-30, xii. 25) follows upon xiv. 28. The expression "in these days" is more suitable as a sequel to the "no little time" of xiv. 28, than to the "whole year" of xi. 26.

The transposition of the two journeys to Jerusalem, and the dislocation of material, is due to the notice of the death of Herod Agrippa in the Jerusalem source (xii. 20-23). This was in 44, and, according to the evidence which St. Luke had at hand, the famine also in xi. 28 must be associated with the same period. In the order of the Gentile source the famine of xi. 28, and the visit to Jerusalem consequent upon it, was subsequent to the expansion of the mission work amongst the Gentiles by the Galatian

mission. But to have inserted the narrative of chapter xii. so late would have been contrary to the plan of the work. The centre of interest, transferred to the Gentile missions, would have been carried back again to the Herodian persecution at Jerusalem, and thus the scheme of development and progress would have been marred.

The course of events in the chronological scheme presented in this paper may be tabulated as follows:—

Conversion of St. Paul (B A)	33
Arabia and Damascus (B Gal.)	33-36
First visit to Jerusalem (B)	36-37
Syria and Cilicia (Gal.)	37-45
The Herodian persecution (B)	42-44
The Famine (A)	45
Mission activity of the Church (B A)	45-46
The Apostolic Conference, second visit (B A)	46-47
The expansion of Mission activity in Galatia (A)	47-49
The third visit (A)	49-50

There is a break in the chronological record between the death of Tiberius in 37 and the accession of Claudius in 41. This break corresponds with the reign of Caius Caligula, whose treatment of the Jews gave some kind of respite to the Church of Jerusalem, and afforded opportunity for the steady growth of the Aramaic communities in the neighbourhood (v. 16). The accession of Herod Agrippa to power at the beginning of the reign of Claudius again turned the attention of the Jewish authorities to this progress of Christianity in their midst. They take occasion to kindle the religious zeal of Agrippa, and induce him to organize a systematic persecution of the Church and its leaders. It was not till after his death that the mission activity burst out again, and then it extended to those Gentiles who had already been drawn to Judaism in the synagogues. The work amongst these proselytes opened up the difficult question of the admission of the Gentiles to Christian fellowship, a question which, as has already been

seen, called for early settlement by the authorities of the Church. It is for that reason that the earlier date, 46-47, is preferable for the conference at Jerusalem.

The chief chronological difficulty presented by this scheme is the date of the visit in 49-50. This is connected in the narrative (xi. 27-30) with the relief of the famine-stricken brethren in Judæa, and took place in the days of Claudius. The reference to Claudius, whose reign extended from 41 to 54, would present no difficulty if the famine in Judæa were not ascribed by Josephus to the years when Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander were successively procurators. Fadus was sent to Judæa on the death of Agrippa in 44, and in 48 Alexander was succeeded by Cumanus. On these grounds it is usual to assign this famine to the years 45 or 46, and to place the visit as near these years as possible. Professor Ramsay places the prophecy of Agabus early in 44, the beginning of the famine in 45, the relief visit of Queen Helena in 45, and the visit of Barnabas and Saul in the winter of 45-46.

The prophecy of Agabus has reference to famine over all the world. The building of the new harbour at Portus in consequence of the silting up of the harbour of Ostia would be a subject of wide-spread interest and conversation along the shores of the Mediterranean. It is associated by Dion Cassius with the great famine, and is regarded as a work of high importance for the trade of Rome. The harbour works of Portus would be thus a standing witness to the famine, and to St. Luke writing between 80 and 90¹ would suggest the reign of Claudius for the "great famine." There is good reason to think that in the synchronisms of St. Luke the famine and the visit are associated not only with this reign but with the death of Herod (xii. 1) and the visit of Helena in 45. But this does not prove that in the original source it was narrowed down to that date.

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 387. .

There is a further advantage in this readjustment, that the chronological order of the visits corresponds with the order in the Galatian Epistle. The winter of 36-37 sets a term to the three years of Galatians i. 18, and the winter of 46-47 to the fourteen years reckoning from the conversion in 33. There is no question of any omission of a journey, and the subject of Gentile liberty seems to recover its natural position of importance in the thought and argument of St. Paul.

There are one or two minor points which appear to support this scheme. The famine was in 45; the mission of St. Peter has been assigned to the years 45 and 46. Is there not in the narrative of chapters ix., x., allusion to the distress caused by the famine in the coast district? Dorcas is prominent by reason of her good works and alms-deeds at Joppa. Cornelius at Cæsarea gave much alms to the people. And may there not also be in the vision of St. Peter a passing allusion to the famine? The strictness as to meats would at such a time be a special trial to the faithful Jews; the vision presented the temptation in a form which would have been frequently felt at the time. It suggested to St. Peter in his exhaustion (x. 10) freer intercourse between Jew and Gentile for the material advantage of both in the fellowship of the Church. The vision is suitable to the period of famine.

The conference took place at Jerusalem in the winter of 46-47. The work of St. Peter amongst the Gentile proselytes of the coast was perhaps the immediate cause of it (xi. 1). The jealousy of the Pharisees had already caused certain teachers to go down to Antioch and stir up strife in the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, and perhaps also to create doubts throughout Phœnicia and Samaria amongst the Gentile Christians. The mission of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem, and the strong tone they had already taken and were prepared to take at the conference, restored confidence in these Churches (xv. 3). Their fellow work at Antioch

was sufficient justification for a more liberal policy. They add their testimony to that of St. Peter, and win for the Gentiles freedom from the bondage of circumcision. The position presented in the Galatian Epistle is similar to that of the Acts. St. Paul laid before the Apostles the gospel he had preached among the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 2), and rehearsed all things that God had done with them (Acts xv. 4). The apostles saw that St. Paul had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision as St. Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 7). St. Paul had for ten years past been labouring among Gentiles (Gal. i. 16); St. Peter had only under strong guidance included the Gentiles within the sphere of his labours (Acts ix., x.); his main work lay amongst the Churches of the circumcision. The apostles made use of the occasion to give authority to Barnabas and Saul to extend their work among the Gentiles; they themselves undertook the responsibility of the supervision of the Jewish Churches. It is only at the close of the conference that the poverty of these Churches is mentioned, and an earnest appeal made on their behalf. Such an appeal is evidence that the poverty caused by the famine of 45 was still felt in the winter of 46-47 in the Churches of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood.

At the close of the conference, Barnabas and Saul return to Antioch in the company of Silas and Judas Barsabbas. They for a short season exercise their prophetic gifts to the edification of the faithful in the Church, and then return to Jerusalem. Barnabas and Saul are then entrusted with apostolic authority to extend the Gentile work to the west, and start on their long journey into Southern Galatia. They return to Antioch in 49, to be reminded by the prophecy of Agabus that the danger from famine had not yet passed, and that the need of the churches of Judæa was still urgent. They go on, therefore, with the alms of the faithful to Jerusalem, in the winter of 49-50.

THOMAS BARNS.

FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT.

THE Biography recently given to the world under this heading, whatever else it may have brought its readers, has vividly revived, for some of them, one of the most indelible and distinct impressions of past life. How tantalizing at times is the endeavour to transfer such impressions! They are as real, as vivid, as the things we see or the sounds we hear, but the endeavour to clothe them in words is like breathing on the crystals of a frosted pane. The consciousness that the needed background of interest may be taken for granted in any reader of this periodical makes it impossible to refrain from an attempt which otherwise it would be impossible to make, but does not remove its difficulties, which indeed spring from its special interest. For those old enough to recall that social and spiritual awakening which coincides with the stir of 1848, and partly marks its reverberation on our shores, the biography of Fenton Hort revives so vividly the sense of standing on the threshold of a new world that such a one hardly knows whether it be created by the record, or recalled by a name and a date. In such circumstances criticism is impossible, and egotism but too likely. If the excuse that the memories which intrude themselves are almost contemporary with those which the book recalls be not valid, the critic has no other.

No group is more accessible to posterity than that to which Fenton Hort belonged. The readers of to-day may know all that a biographer can tell about Frederick Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and the men who surrounded them. The world was, when they began to influence it, more moved by strong personal influences, more divided into groups of disciples, than it is now. We were less arrayed in serried ranks of "classes and masses"; we were

rather clusters of listeners, or would-be listeners, to this or that prophet or preacher. The influence of one such teacher, round whose brow the aureole does not fade, is felt in reading Hort's biography perhaps more vividly than in reading his own. In 1851, when Hort took his degree, the Church of England, just abdicating her "high" pretensions and preparing to be known as a "broad" Church, was centered for many eager and thirsty listeners in the person of Frederick Maurice; and an account of a Sunday afternoon at Lincoln's Inn Chapel given here will recall to a few survivors some of the best hours of their lives. Those tremulous, penetrating tones, which seemed to hurry on to some newly heard message full of blessing for mankind; that pale face, to which the "storied windows," fading with the daylight, seemed to transfer their illumination; those eyes, looking as it were into "the thick darkness where God was"—as we turn the page they recur, and with them that sense of the dawn of a new day which marks the voice of the prophet in every generation, and must not be considered illusory because, as we look back, the dawn seems to pass into the twilight. I recall a specially vivid emergence of that hope in my own mind when walking home with one dear to Maurice—Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen. "Should you say," he asked, turning to another friend, "that there has been much rejection of the message of Christ among working men?" "I should say there was now no acceptance of it." "I do not wonder; it has never hitherto been set forth otherwise than in an immoral form." The reminiscence recurs with Hort's biography, as expressing, with a certain exaggeration which was characteristic of the speaker when strongly moved and words seemed inadequate, our vivid belief, under that influence, that the message of Christ only needed to be set forth as we had just heard it, or with some added elements which seemed close at hand, in order to repeat the victory of the first days of Christianity.

A great disappointment generally follows hopes initiated by a great surrender. An utterance of Fenton Hort's, given the world since his death, seems to me so adequately to meet that disappointment, that at the risk of transcribing words with which all readers of this notice will be familiar, I will copy from his Hulsean lectures the paragraph in which he attempts to gather up the lesson of the bereaved disciples, and bring it home to those who, at a later date, experience something like a repetition of that bereavement in the obscuration of their faith.

“The eve of the Passion is not the only time when Christ has seemed to His Church to be departing from the earth of which for a while He had been a denizen, and when those whose course has been in great part shaped by the discipleship to Christ which surrounded them have felt with dismay that the sustaining habitudes were passing away. His own palpable presence in the flesh has its counterpart, at least as regards the sense of security which it afforded, in a ‘Christian world,’ an assemblage of nations where deference to His Name and acquiescence in His authority receive full public and private recognition. When it becomes manifest that a Christian world in this sense is ceasing to exist, either because Christ’s authority is becoming limited to a single narrow department of individual life, or because His right to authority is questioned altogether at its fountain-head, then the band of His disciples may naturally feel as though He were once more leaving them to themselves. They cannot go backward; if discipleship has not yet taught them the way, it has at least disabled them for ever from resting contented without a way, and convinced them no less that elsewhere it is not to be found. Yet it is hard to see either whitherward the Lord is departing or after what manner the original command to follow Him is henceforth to be obeyed.”

No words, to my mind, describe more perfectly what

some of us who remember those services in Lincoln's Inn recall of struggle and despondency between that time and this. Nor do any words more suggest all that would rebuke that despondency. It seems strange that the little volume from which they are taken is almost the only record of such a faith and such a clear discernment of all at a particular epoch that opposed faith. It is pathetic to remember that one who had so much to say was never enabled, in the full sense of the words, to break silence.

To break silence! the very expression is significant. A barrier has to be broken before one who waits to gather up the conflicting testimonies of life's experience can find words for his thoughts. A large part of the remembered conversation with such a one seems to consist in some check on hasty statement or rash assumption; and when one would recall what was most individual, it seems to have been all negative. It would be truer to say of Hort that all his utterances were positive, but it is just these which are apt, in contact with hasty criticism, to take a negative aspect. "There is much to be said," he wrote to me in 1877, in answer to some expression of my hope for his future which I have forgotten, "for refraining from correcting impressions which are not substantially incorrect. . . . What I feel most is the sense of the undoubted and actual unproductiveness, when so much craves to be produced." The sentence, with its guarded carefulness, seems to me to sum up his life. So much in him *craved* to be produced. His influence, as I recall it, seemed to open a vista; there was sometimes disappointment in its not being followed up, but the opening was there. I remember feeling it a vivid and permanent influence after a conversation of which I can only remember the sentence, "No one did any one thing well who tried to do only that one thing." The words as I recall them, and as they are expanded by many passages in his biography, gather up a

sense of life as a whole, of *the beyond* as supplying a needed background and atmosphere to the present, which often expresses itself in the stress and strain of human intercourse as the negation of a negation, but which, in its impartial receptiveness, disentangled from the premature exclusions of logic, is actually the subjective side of what we mean by truth.

But one sometimes doubts whether something which (to save a lengthy paraphrase) may be presumptuously termed *error* be not almost a necessity for much achievement in the way of obvious and tangible memorials of a teacher. With a clear consciousness of the seeming arrogance and exaggeration of such a statement, I should yet say that none of the elder contemporaries whose names give interest to the pages of his biography seem to me to have seen life from points of view as opposite—in other words, with a balance as true—as he did. As one looks back toward the years recorded in the earlier part of his biography one seems to recall chance intercourse with fellow travellers in a crowded railway carriage, which some of its inmates had entered by mere mistake. This one was starting for India; that one was to find his destination in an hour; another was anxious to retrace his steps at the very first opportunity. We were in close community for a moment; but the goals of some fellow travellers then were remote as the poles. In that motley throng I recognise few who, knowing their own aim as clearly as Fenton Hort, could have gone so far with their neighbours. A perusal of his biography, interrupted at the account of his welcome to the Darwinian theory, might lead to a strangely mistaken view of his deepest sympathies and his ultimate position. He was not capable of taking up the position, soon so surprisingly common, and epigrammatically commemorated by Mr. Max Müller, as a belief that the world was created twice, the first time according to Moses, and the second

according to Darwin. He could never have felt, with many devout and earnest persons, that it needed only a true apprehension of both authorities to reduce their antagonism to insignificance. But he seems always to have felt it waste of time to criticise the part of a message—whether bad science associated with theology, or bad philosophy associated with science—on which the messenger has nothing to teach us. For such minds a blank often records the truest vision of the Divine parable of the ages. That embodiment of the eternal in the temporal which makes up the course of human development is least readily paraphrased in human utterance by those who most adequately discern both its elements. Those who would obliterate either the indications which lead men from the natural to the supernatural, or those which form a barrier in that path, have in either case much to utter. Those who discern both in their true proportion know but little stimulus towards that one-sided expression which is all that seems possible. The thing is *there*; why try to have it elsewhere?

This silencing influence, I suppose, must have been felt by all who had much intercourse with him. Certainly he felt it himself when he spoke of the “unwholesome reserve” which had kept him even from intimacy with his children; and, though one would not have used that epithet, one felt his reserve sometimes disappointing in the midst of ready and ungrudging intercourse, when one sought to enter on the realms of deepest import. To turn to him for literary help was to meet immediate, eager, adequate communication. His library contained just such a book as you wanted—there it was, there was his account of it, precise, clear, perfectly satisfying. How gladly would his grateful hearer have gone beyond the question of texts and authorities, and sought his views on the fundamental realities which underlay all the criticism and scholarship! There one seemed to enter the realm of silence. Such

reminiscences, perhaps, do something to explain the contrast between the list of his literary projects and that of his printed work. What influence would have bridged the chasm between them? Better health, more leisure, longer life? Yes, all had doubtless their part, the first especially, but even the lack of this seems less important than that double-edged discernment which, in such a time as he lived through, loads utterance with a weight under which it can hardly move.

He lived through a great revolution in the spiritual environment of man. The background of assumption and feeling which to us who remember that earlier world seemed as solid as a row of mountains, now appears as evanescent as a wreath of clouds. Decisions which encompassed us then like the atmosphere we breathe now seem as much a part of individual selection as the food we swallow; those who believe the very things that ordinary people believed sixty or fifty years ago, believe them now in a different sense, and with a quite different feeling. It now requires some courage to assert what then it required much courage to deny. If any one now pays that homage to the Invisible then paid by most people, it is one to whom the Invisible is the keynote of life. The things of sense were as importunate half a century ago as they are now, the promises of Faith as forgettable. But while the ideal of a Christian *nation* was dominant, the indifferent were ranged with the sympathetic; and now that it is discarded, the indifferent are ranged with the hostile. The change seems to take place in a moment. Yesterday the world seemed with us, to-day it seems against us. It is natural; the world does but echo the accents of authority. When they were found on the side of theology, the world was quasi-theological; when they changed to the side of science, the world was quasi-scientific. The change was momentous. But it was only to a minority that the renunciation was great.

The party which commemorates this transition, and aims at bridging the interval between the old condition and the new, is known as the Broad Church. That might always have been the title of the Church of England. The aim of compromise, or of comprehensiveness (according as we describe that aim in hostile or in friendly terms) is incorporated in its very essence. And the antagonistic interests which it would reconcile in our day, those respectively of Science and of Theology, being as remote as possible, the title might seem in our time peculiarly appropriate. Yet I can never use it without reluctance, so unsuitable does it appear to me to describe the character and belief of the one who gave the movement its depth, its volume, and its momentum. The antagonism between Science and Theology is one Frederick Maurice never discerned; the change by which "the religious world" should vanish, and be replaced by the scientific world, would have seemed to him a very unimportant disadvantage, if he considered it a disadvantage at all. An epithet which has been applied to Spinoza seems to me applicable to him: as some men are atheists, Maurice might be called an acosmist. No phrase could be more unjust if it were supposed to imply an indifference to the secular interests of his countrymen; he did more for them than some who have attended to nothing else. He was among the first to develop the education of women and the working classes, and to set on foot that co-operative movement which has since his time made such vast strides. But with all this, he was yet as blind to that in the world which conceals God as an atheist is to that in the world which reveals Him. And surely not to see this is not to see the world at all.

To think this of any teacher is to deny his position in a *broad* Church, and, in fact, Maurice himself would never have accepted such a description. He disliked and rejected all such names, but I think actually he was not so far from

either of the other parties in the Church as from that heterogeneous group which finds its coherence only in what it denies. Nevertheless some of its denials were so important, so needed, and so emancipating, that for the moment they were more uniting than a more positive creed. It is difficult now to realize the sudden sense of emancipation which came with a corporate disbelief in an endless hell. Those who had never believed it, yet found a vast release of spiritual force when they were enabled to disbelieve it in company with teachers for whom holiness and sin were words of vital significance. Most people, when they read the *Inferno* of Dante, say to themselves that these were always nightmare fancies, used by the poet as mere symbols. And yet if you opened almost any religious book current fifty years ago, you would find something like that in the background. "No doubt," says Dr. Arnold in one of his sermons, "there will only be two divisions at last—the lost and the saved." I shall never forget the shock with which I came upon those words, not many years before the letter on this subject from Hort to Maurice which led to their acquaintance, and which was not without influence, it seems to me, on that controversy which dismissed the superstition for ever from the belief of Christian England. Any one who will peruse that appeal, and the interesting fragment of biography which it elicited in reply, will realize that less than two generations ago we did need to be assured that the Father in Heaven was not as cruel as the worst of earthly parents, and more capricious than any conceivable human being. I date my own emancipation to contact with the anguish of a mother whose son was drowned in seeking to save a life. It was possible then to fancy that while selfishness might have secured heaven, one who laid down his life for a fellow creature was requited with hell. Of course, many disbelieved it then, and taught their children to disbelieve it. Maurice's own parents had done so. But

he recoiled as much from "the belief in universal restitution" which had been the lesson of his youth, as Hort did from the belief in an eternity of torment. "I had a certain revolting, partly of intellect and partly of conscience, against what struck me as a feeble notion of the Divine perfections, one which represented *good nature* as the highest of them. . . . I found it more and more impossible to trust in any being who did not hate selfishness, and who did not desire to raise His creatures out of it." I give this extract from Maurice's letter to the young Cambridge student of 1849 partly because it seems to me to show why we needed a Maurice to deliver us from a superstition which a rational mind could entertain only by forgetting its meaning. There was not another teacher gifted with his power of utterance who saw the truth in the neighbourhood of that superstition to which he gave its death-blow. Perhaps some of the vehemence which came out in him at certain stages of the controversy were the result of that agitating emotion which all must feel who aim, like William Tell, at an object narrowly bordering on a precious life.

But that extract is made mainly in order to show what Maurice recognised in the appeal which drew it forth. The letter from the youth of twenty-one is actually the earliest expression bearing on the controversy in accessible print, and had, we cannot doubt, some influence in giving it shape. To my mind that letter exhibits much of the strength we find in the answer, and also some which we do not find there. Hort revered truth as his teacher did, but he respected fact far more. If any one deems that reverence for truth *is* respect for fact, let him beware how he deny it to Frederick Maurice. But the memory of the disciple and the master side by side is to my mind a vivid exhibition of the difference between the two qualities.

Fenton Hort was, in the deepest sense of the word, a broad Churchman. It was not perhaps a sense which can

be largely illustrated for any one who never knew him. The Hulsean lectures, with an extract from which I will conclude, as I began, this imperfect sketch, do indeed express the thing I mean: they seem to me to echo the stately and temperate measure of that seventeenth century English theology which may be taken as the perennial type of all Broad Churches. From the causes I have mentioned, Hort always seemed to me (of late years I saw him but little) to avoid any allusion to the controversies of the hour, and it is only from these that we can bring home the notion of a Broad Church to the popular imagination; but he manifested to all who knew him a living sympathy with feelings and beliefs ordinarily ranged in the sharpest antagonism, and apparently dividing between them the whole world of thought. His life-work—a formation of the text of the New Testament—was executed in the same spirit which was exercised and developed by that love of botany attested by actually the preponderance in the list of printed works given at the end of his biography. Here we find the influences which gave his mind its peculiar equipoise. His interest in science secured him from the influence of that superstition now so fast vanishing—the opinion that a narrative of supernatural events must be supernaturally secured from error. His still deeper interest in theology held at bay the strange and dominant inversion of that superstition—the opinion that a record in which there is nothing supernatural cannot commemorate supernatural events. I know no words which have so recalled Maurice's voice to me as those in the Hulsean lectures which I began by transcribing and those with which I now conclude, but the extracts must convey to any attentive reader a vision of the earthly beside the heavenly which was lacking to him, and must inevitably be lacking to most of those whose life is wholly in the all-absorbing vision of the Eternal.

“We are full of inconsistencies, and so is all around us.

But those inconsistencies are the mark of the passage from the lower consistency of unconscious animal life to the higher consistency of spiritual life, preserving and perfecting every element of the animal life, yet transforming it by the new creation. To go back now to the lower consistency means to choose chaos, darkness, death. . . . Yet we ought never to be satisfied with inconsistency. We must struggle forward towards a rational and effectual Unity.”¹

JULIA WEDGWOOD.

¹ *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, p. 168.

ERRATUM.

In the September No. page 195, line 15, *for* A.D. 96, *read* A.D. 69.

[*The transposition of the figures was a printer's error.*]

ANANIAS OF SHIRAK UPON CHRISTMAS.

I.

PREFACE OF TRANSLATOR.

[THE following homily is translated from an Armenian writer, Ananias, son of John of Shirak, who lived early in the seventh century. In a brief autobiography which this writer left behind him, he describes how as a youth he went to the Greek city, Theodoupolis, in search of a mathematical teacher, named Eliazar. Thence he went to another teacher called Christodotus, in fourth Armenia, for six months. Thence to Constantinople, and then to Trebizond, where he remained eight years as the pupil of a certain Tychicus, learned in both Greek and Armenian, who lived by the shrine of S. Eugenia. Tychicus, he says, had a vast library full of books apocryphal and open, ecclesiastical and profane, scientific and historical, medical or chronological. During the reign of the Emperor Maurice (who died 602), Tychicus had visited Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople and Athens in pursuit of learning and of books.

Thus it is conceivable that Ananias had access even to primitive sources now lost to us, and in forming an estimate of the genuineness of the long citation from Polycarp of Ephesus with which this homily concludes, this should be taken into account. I drew attention to this citation of Polycarp in the *Guardian* (1894, July 18), and Professor Harnack, in his *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1894, No. 23), wrote in regard to it as follows: "What is related of Polycarp may be believed at a pinch, if we compare the information given by Irenæus about the communications of Presbyters of Asia Minor; and if one thinks how early questions must have emerged about the day and month of important events in the life of Jesus; and if one also takes into account—supposing one esteems them to be

genuine—the alleged *Responsiones* of Polycarp handed down by Victor.”

Professor Harnack, however, leans against the genuineness of the citation, because he cannot believe the account given by Ananias in his other tract on Easter of the calendarial activity of Aristides the Apologist, and of Leonidas, father of Origen. Surely this is hypercritical. Ananias may have been wrong about the latter, and yet have been right about Polycarp; especially if—as Harnack admits—the citation is on other grounds likely to be genuine. In any case, the citation—of which the text is, unhappily, it would seem, mutilated—must be read as part of the whole treatise, before its authenticity can be properly appraised. And I cannot but think that the general tone of the treatise is greatly in favour of it. For it proves the absolute *bona fides* of Ananias—proves that he is not making it up, but is quoting some document which claimed to be Polycarp’s own writing. And this document was probably a note in some old calendarial document which he had read in the rich library of Tychicus of Trebizond. It is just in such documents that one expects to find preserved old opinions of the earliest fathers. This very treatise of Ananias seems to have formed, along with his other treatise on Easter, the exordium of an elaborate calendar, which, some one unspecified constructed of a cycle of 532 years,¹ from the year 828 of the reckoning of Alexandria to the year 1360 of the same. This we learn from the close of his treatise on Easter.

Of almost equal interest with the excerpt of Polycarp is the allusion to those, whoever they were, who declared that the celebration of the birth of Christ on December 25, and apart from the feast of the baptism, was invented by the disciples of Cerinthus. If so, we can understand the hesitation of the orthodox Church to adopt our modern festival of Christmas. Probably the real significance of the early union of the Nativity with the Baptism is that the Baptism was regarded as itself the true Birth of Christ. Docetic opinion may have been too strong in the earliest Church to permit of his carnal or earthly birth being celebrated at all. Sometime in the fourth century the very early read-

¹ I.e., one Dionysian cycle, so called.

ing in Luke iii. 23 : "Thou art My beloved Son, *This day have I begotten Thee*," was erased from nearly all codices; no doubt because it was the stronghold of those who had declared the Baptism alone to be the true nativity of Jesus Christ. Ananias also gives us some new data as regards the gradual diffusion of our modern Christmas.

The citation from Makarius I., Patriarch of Jerusalem, is also interesting; and not less so the information about the lectionary of Cyril of Jerusalem. The latter is new. As for Makarius, I hope shortly to publish in English the full text of his *Encyclical to the Armenians* on the feasts which should be observed in the Church.—FRED. C. CONYBEARE.]

THE DISCOURSE OF ANANIAS, CALLED THE COUNTER UPON THE EPIPHANY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR.

We have taken much trouble and pains about the holy festivals of God; and this is the result at which we have arrived, and which we are become worthy to set forth.

First, the Festival of the Birth of Christ our God, which is the beginning of festivals, and of our yearly [cycles],¹ and chief of the fixed feasts (= *πανηγυρίδων*), and of all commemorations of Christ. The Festival of the holy Birth of Christ, on the 12th day before the feast of the Baptism, was not appointed by the holy apostles, nor by their successors either, as is clear from the canons of the holy apostles. For it is written in the 6th chapter of the canons as follows:² that the apostles appointed and laid it down firmly, that the Festival of the Birth and Epiphany of our Lord and Saviour, the chief and first of the festivals of the Churches [should be] on the 21st day of the month Tebeth, which is 6th of January, according to the Romans.

But many years after their fixing the canons, this fes-

¹ Words in square brackets have been supplied by the translator as being necessary to the sense.

² In the Arm. Edition (Dashian, Vienna, 1896), and in the MSS. of these apocryphal canons the citation given by Ananias occurs in Can. vii.

tival¹ was invented, as some say, by the disciples of the heretic Cerinthus; and was accepted by the Greeks, because they were truly fond of festivals and most fervent in piety; and by them it was spread and diffused all over the world.

But in the days of the holy Constantine, in the holy Council of Nice, this festival was not received by the holy fathers; but they appointed the festival to be held in accordance with the aforesaid canon of the holy apostles. And it is clear from the letter of the blessed Makarius, patriarch of Jerusalem, which he wrote to the country of the Armenians concerning the institution of the holy Baptism. For he was one of the 318 holy fathers of Nicæa. And it is written as follows in the sixth chapter of his letter of command and counsel (*or encyclical*).

“But there is the ordinance of baptism of the holy font, and there is the earnest observance of the three festivals. Wherein our race² is most eager with genuine piety³ to cherish the observances dedicated to God, and to carry out the great pattern of the salutary mystery, which was fulfilled in the holy and famous days. And this celebration they are very zealous to keep in the holy places of Christ; and all Christians who fear Christ must also fulfil in them (? in themselves) the calling of baptism at the holy epiphany of the birth of the Lord, and of the saving passover of the quickening passion of Christ; and of Pentecost full of grace, when the Divine descent of the vivifying overflowed among us. And of these several festivals, of the birth and baptism, you must understand the significance, in order that you may zealously carry out the same. For on the same salutary day with the illumining

¹ *I.e.*, the separate commemoration of the Birth—apart from the baptism—on the 12th day before the 6th January—Christmas Day as we now call it.

² *I.e.*, the Christians, who are commonly spoken of as a *genus* or race in the earlier fathers. The Arm. text has *megazd*, a *vox nihili*, for which I read *mer azg*, and render accordingly.

³ Reading *mtermouthian* for the *vox nihili mrtouthian*.

birth of Christ is our expiatory birth of the holy font also fulfilled. For on the same day He deigned to be baptized because of His descent unto us. For it was not that He was Himself in need of cleansing; but He desired to cleanse us from the dross of sin, he that with a loud voice cried out, saying: "Except a man be born of water and of spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," in order that, being born along with Christ in one and the same fashion, we may also be baptized along with Him on the day of His birth.

Next in the quickening resurrection of Easter by mortifying our sins in the waters of the font, we become imitators of the mortification by death of our Lord Jesus Christ; and by the triple immersion, being buried in the waters of the holy font, we symbolize in ourselves baptized the three-days' burial of our Lord. And this also the divine apostle shows, when he says: Buried with Him in baptism, let us become imitators of the likeness of his death; that by the newness of the resurrection we may become participators with Him in life eternal.

But on the grace-bestowing day of sanctifying Pentecost was the bright revelation of the quickening Spirit, which, in the form of fiery tongues, descended on the apostles; vouchsafing to them [that] laying hands on the baptized [these shall] receive gifts from the Spirit of grace.¹ After the same pattern we also, on the same day, lay hands on the baptised and bestow the same spirit. Of this we fulfil the pattern with unfailing care, that we may become perfect. So far Makarius.

Gregory Theologus also bears witness with Makarius on this point in regard to celebrating the baptism in three feasts, in his discourse "upon baptism," in which he assails those who are supine about baptism, and says: "Thou makest this and that a pretext, and allegest the excuse of

¹ Such seems the meaning of an unusually cumbrous sentence.

sins. Thou sayest: I wait for the epiphany of the Lord, for the resurrection of the Lord, which to me is more precious. I wait for the Pentecost. It is better to be illumined with Christ; with Christ to arise on the day of resurrection; to celebrate the manifesting of the Spirit. And then what? The last day will come on in a way which thou wilt not know, and in a season when thou art not thinking of it. Thou hast all thy time for baptism, because thou hast all of it also for death."

But after him Saint Cyril succeeded to the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, and to the throne of the holy Constantine succeeded his son Constantius, along with his brothers. They say that he believed in the heresy of Arius. However, he did not fight against the truth; but left both sides alone to do as they liked. Whatsoever any one pleased he kept, whether orthodoxy or kakodoxy. In his days this festival¹ was admitted in the royal court; and in all places where any one chose to keep it they kept it freely and openly, except in the metropolises of the four Patriarchs, who had the thrones of the holy Evangelists. For at that time they had not forcibly transferred the throne of St. John from Ephesus to Constantinople. And [this] is clear from the canonical disposition of lections of St. Cyril. For therein it is written thus: "That on the 25th of the month of December is the feast of David and Jacobus, which day in other cities they make the birth of Christ." About this the Greeks say as follows: that because the patriarch, with all the clergy and the bulk of the congregation, repair to Bethlehem and there keep feast, therefore the few priests who remain in the city celebrate the feast of David and Jacobus; as if the lections only belonged to the city. And they contend that this is why he wrote the words "in other cities," as if having Bethlehem in view. But this

¹ *I.e.*, the modern Christmas on December 25th as opposed to the older joint festival on January 6th.

argument no really sensible person ever adopted. For if we admit it, for what reason did this same Cyril fix the canon of the birth on the 6th of January? For at the beginning of the canon we find it written thus: that "the feast of the holy Epiphany is kept in January, on the 6th of the month. They shall assemble in the shepherd's dwelling,¹ and repeat the following canon; and then in Bethlehem and in the cave." Here then you see that he appoints both feasts to be celebrated on one day; and who will be so rash as to find any fault with the blessed Cyril or with his dispositions? And who [was ever] like him with Christ? And to whom else did such a sign ever appear [as to him]? and by whom else were so many myriads ever illuminated?² Methinks not even by St. Paul. For on the day of the apparition of the luminous cross, countless myriads of myriads believed, of Jews and of heathen. For until the day of Constantius, son of Constantine, the Jews were prevented from going down to Jerusalem, but by him many Jews were freely allowed to congregate, and they fixed their abodes in Jerusalem. But also the Jews who were in Tiberias and in other cities were congregated there for the festival. And, moreover, many of the heathen were collected there because of the general concourse [who] were come to trade; and these, having seen the divine apparition, believed in Christ; and all hastened to be baptized, so that the fonts and cistern tanks were not enough for them; till at last the blessed saint ordered the great baths which were called the public baths³ to be cleansed, that they might there carry on the saving rite of baptism. This was the third sign which happened in Jerusalem on the day of the holy Pentecost. But I think it was on a loftier scale than the first, in so far as,

¹ Perhaps this was a building traditionally associated with the shepherds who watched their flocks by night.

² *I.e.*, baptised.

³ The Armenian has "*demososin*," a misspelling of "*dēmosios*."

though the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles was seen by all in the midst of a multitude of assembled Jews and men of many other races, who in the Acts of the Apostles are mentioned by name, yet on that occasion the Spirit was bestowed on the Apostles alone. But the occasion of this multitude being assembled for holy baptism was also much more sublime than the second occasion, which Josephus relates : how that on the day of Pentecost a quaking and panic took hold first of the priests and then of the whole congregation. Then also on a sudden a voice was heard from the very depths of the temple, saying these words : We depart hence, we depart. But on this last occasion the powers of the Lord do not come forth from beneath our feet, but were plainly manifested to come from above, and were [? + not] bestowed in secret ; so much so that the blessed Cyril was prompt to write to the Emperor Constantius a letter of entreaty summoning him [to be] pious and instructed in the things of God. For he thought that by his supplication he would gain his salvation ; by laying before him the divine sign which had occurred, and the multitude of those converted, as if to say, Why art not thou also with them ?

So then, if the Greeks are resolved to despise this, they have no respect either for time or for the gospel, because of their not admitting the festival of the birth. For the one and the other show both the birth and the baptism of Christ our God to have been on one and the same day. For it is written in Luke's Gospel, in the mystery of the baptism, thus : that Jesus Himself was of about thirty years beginning. See how clearly it proves that on the same day with His birth He was baptised, and then made a beginning both of the thirtieth year of His age and of His teaching. This also do the Greeks say, that it is possible for the twelfth day to be the beginning of the year, and not its middle or end either ; if we so understand, of the seventy

days also it is possible to say that it is not middle of the year or end. But in regard to the apostolic canon, the Greeks argue thus: that the Apostles had no leisure to narrowly seek out feast days, for their occupation was in preaching, and in separating and holding [men] aloof from heathen festivals. Will any one really be content to hear such a thing said of the Apostles as that they were certainly so careless as this about the appointing of festivals? Why, in that case, did they teach us to worship turning towards the east? Why, also, to meet together and feast Sunday, to honour it and be idle on it? Or to fast on the fourth day of the week and on Fridays? For all these are lesser points than the festivals of the birth and baptism.

However, we would waive this point with them if only they would be persuaded in regard to others. For they declare in regard to the holy fathers at Nice that God concealed this from them; for that He does not give all graces to any one person. If the usage had not been discussed by them—yes. But they were aware of it, and condemned it, and spoke “of the Birth which in other cities they think¹ to celebrate.” But I assent to those of whom the Greeks boast—I mean, to the blessed Basil and Gregory Anzianz (*i.e.*, Nazianzen). Them I know to be holy, true, spiritual, and followers of the Apostles. And if they had any precept about this, I accept it, even as Paul commands, saying: If it be revealed to a second, let the first listen.

But I perceive no precept of theirs about this festival; but St. Cyril, who appointed the lections and psalms for the two festivals, I do not understand thereby to have separated the two, but to have kept in full the rituals, and to have celebrated the feasts of both mysteries on one and the same day. But those who suppose St. Gregory to separate the feasts in his argument, are not able to point to any precept

¹ Perhaps render “are accustomed to celebrate,” as if *νομίζουσιν* underlay the Armenian.

of his about it, but derive some sort of evidence from his statements, and garble them to please themselves. They declare that in the discourse on the Birth he says as follows, "A little later then thou wilt see Jesus cleansed in the Jordan"¹ and they declare that he pronounced this discourse on the day of the birth. And a little later on he refers to the twelve days which precede the baptism. To this we shall make this answer. I understand it thus: he simply uses his expression "a little later" in connection with the same passage, where he says, "But if thou art scandalized by His being made flesh and debasing Himself, why, then, 'a little later' thou shalt see Jesus cleansing the Jordan by His baptism, and not debasing but enriching the flesh by cleaving the heavens, and with divine grace testified unto by the Father and by the Spirit." In the second place, if you so understand the passage, then you must conceive Him as going to be baptized subsequently to His resurrection; for previously to this passage He has been dwelling upon His passion and resurrection, and in connection with the same He uses the same words, and says, "so then a little later." However, if you clear your mind, you will easily understand from this very discourse that He fixed both feasts on one day. For in another passage in the same discourse He speaks as follows: "But now is the feast of the Epiphany of God, for God appeared as man by birth." So, then, he combines the two. This also do the Greeks allege, that the name epiphany is used of two feasts, both of the birth and of the baptism. I reply that this is notorious to all, that the name epiphany is applied to the 6th of January, and not to the 25th of December, either by the Greeks or by other races, and that no one ever heard of two epiphanies, but only of one. If, therefore, He uses the term epiphany, and is discoursing on the birth, He clearly appoints both on one day.

¹ Greg. Theol., Or. 38. In *Theophania*, p. 673.

Then, again, the Greeks adduce as evidence of their case the following words from the discourse on the baptism: "We have then celebrated the [things] befitting (=τὰ εἰκότα) the birth." And pondering the same, he says: "But on this occasion the action of Christ is one thing and the secret thought another." Well, I assent. The action is one and the thought another. But not on another day. For the first words testify this to me. "We have celebrated the [things] befitting the birth," he says, and not the [fact] of the birth. For, had it been by twelve days later, he must have said the [fact] of the birth, and not the [things] of the birth.

Again, if it was not all on one day, why did he mention the day of the birth, and not simply say, "the secret thought" (*or* mystery), as elsewhere he does of the economy and of the passion? But you mention the depreciators while you pass over those who magnify and elevate, as the very same Gregory says. Come, then, mark me also that passage which in the discourse of baptism he utters as follows: "Three births our discourse knoweth, the one in the flesh, and the one by baptism, and the one by the resurrection." And, dwelling on the same, he adds: "All these births my Christ manifestly honoured, [the first] by the great afflatus, primal and animating; and the second by being made flesh and by the baptism, where-with He was Himself baptised; but the third by the resurrection, which He Himself initiated. As he was the eldest among many brethren, so also He deigned to become eldest among the dead. But as touching two births—I mean the first and the last—the present is not the time to philosophize; but concerning the middle one and that which is now necessary to us; of the same name with which is the day of illumination."¹

See how he combines the two. Let them see, who have

¹ See Gregory Naz., *Discourse 39 on Holy Baptism*, near the beginning.

intelligence; the being made flesh and the baptism are one birth upon one day, after which, he says, is even named the day of illumination.

But let us see how the Greeks fit in with the dumbness of Zachariah the six-months-long lapse of days of the pregnancy of Elizabeth, at the end of which we must understand the day of the annunciation of Gabriel. This, however, is the arguments of the Greeks: On the same day on which Zachariah was dumbfounded, on that very day he approached his wife; and she conceived by him on the very same day. Then they count 180 days, which throws the day of the annunciation of Gabriel on to the 25th March. From that day they count 276 days of the Holy Virgin's pregnancy, to suit the ten months' gestation of the first-born child, and that throws the birth on the 25th of December.

Now I ask you to give me your best attention while we investigate the following passage. First the text, and then the Gospel. For the text runs as follows: "My festivals consecrated shall be called holy by you. Three times in the year shall ye keep festival. Every male of you shall be before me, and ye shall offer sacrifices to the Lord."¹ And before that he saith: "In the seventh month, the first day thereof, let it be called holy by you. No work at all shall ye do on it."² And the tenth day of the same seventh month, let it be kept holy by you. Humble yourselves from the ninth day of the month for three days. And every one who shall not humble himself, he shall be destroyed out of his congregation. And let the tenth day be hallowed by you; for it is a day of expiation for you. No work shall ye do upon it. A Sabbath of Sabbaths is it [and] a rest. Ye shall offer a sacrifice to the Lord in expiation for yourselves. And the fifteenth day of the same seventh month, called the Festival of Tabernacles, shall be

¹ Deut. xvi. 16.

² Lev. xxiii. 24, foll.

holy for you. No menial work shall ye do on it. In tents ye shall dwell for seven days at rest. Offer offerings to the Lord for seven days; and the seventh day shall be called holy, a Sabbath rest. No menial work shall ye do on it." So the text.

So then Zachariah's dumbness exactly fell on the tenth of Tisri; for that is the seventh month. And it was the day of expiation, on which the high priest entered the Holy of Holies, once in the year. To which also Paul bears witness. But on the same day it was not convenient that Zachariah should approach his wife; for he was the high priest of the year, and the great Feast of Tabernacles impended, and all Israel was convoked there. For seven days they were to feast the Festival of Tabernacles, and it was impossible for the high priest to leave the congregation and go to his house; for it was far away, and he had not his dwelling in Jerusalem. And the holy Gospel is my evidence for this, for in it it is written: "And the congregation was waiting for Zachariah, and marvelled at his tarrying in the temple. And when he came out, he could not speak to them; and they understood that he had seen a vision in the temple. And he conversed with them in signs and remained dumb. And it came to pass when the days of his ministration were fulfilled, he went to his house. And after those days Elizabeth his wife conceived." See how clearly he implies that after the completion of the days of the festival it came to pass that Zachariah approached his wife. And to make the statement more sure he repeats a second time the phrase, "having completed the days of his ministry." And again, "after those days." And who can mistake their meaning, namely, that it was so long as he was enjoining the congregation to sanctify and respect, not only the feast, but also, because of the feast, the beginning of the month and the first day's evening. How then between two chief festivals could the high priest leave the

congregation, and, going to his house, approach his wife? or [could he] on the very day of the feast? Be it not therefore ours to contradict and dispute, puffed up with our subtleties; but let us assent to the truth and to the Divine writings, which make it clear that it was on the tenth of the month Tisri that Zachariah approached his wife and that Elizabeth conceived. If we then count the 180 days of six months, that fixes the 16th of the month Nisan—which is the 6th April according to the Romans—and at this date was the annunciation of the Holy Virgin. Then, counting the period of ten months' gestation of the first-born, we have a full 276 days, ending on the 21st of the month Tebeth, which is the sixth of January, according to the Romans.

Here let us take a firm stand, and one not to be overthrown. And heaven forbid we should divide it into two. But on one day let us keep the birth and the baptism, and, maintaining intact the appointments of both, let us follow the holy Apostles and blessed fathers of Nice and our own teachers. For it is not true that [the new Christmas] did not reach them, and that therefore they did not receive it; but a long time ago [this feast] came to our land, and was accepted as by men who were ignorant of the truth. And it lasted many, many years, until the blessed John Katholicos, who by family was a Mandakuni. And then he made search for the truth, and after inquiry and getting at the truth, he commanded it to be abandoned. And after him we too will follow and give this answer to the Greeks, that we are pupils of the holy fathers in Nice; and what we learned we keep firmly and will not twist it awry. As for you, if ye do not walk in the paths of your own fathers, it appears to me that the temper of the Jews has taken possession of you, as they taught the Samaritans. And the Samaritans kept what they learned. But you resemble them. It does no harm to us.

But we are on surer ground than the Samaritans, and by far more sublime and divine; and for you we have no other answer. For you do not enjoin on us to do the truth, but impose always on us your own tyrannical and over-subtle fancies. I know a few of the Greeks who kept this feast until the Emperor Justinian; but all were constrained by him, and received it—Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, and every land. But be it not ours to feel any such dread of human commands as that we should over-ride the divine. And if it please you, I will utter Job's words: If I should go wrong, make me intelligent. But if they scorn the words of truth, at least let us not turn perversely from the path of the fathers.

Let us then set forth clearly in what month and on what days of the month the several nations keep the holy Epiphany:—

A. The Epiphany, according to the Hebrews, falls in the month Tebeth, on the 21st day always.

B. The Epiphany, according to the Syrians, in the month Kanoun, on the 6th day always.

C. The Epiphany, according to the Arabs, in the month Arson (? Assam), on the 21st day always.

D. The Epiphany, according to the Ethiopians, in the month Teras (= Tir), on the 11th day always.

E. The Epiphany, according to the Egyptians, in the month Tubil, on the 11th day always.

F. The Epiphany, according to the Macedonians, in the month Maimakterion,¹ on the 21st day always.

G. The Epiphany, according to the Greeks, in the month Eudineus (Ἐϋδυναιός), on the 6th day always.

H. The Epiphany, according to the Romans, in the month of January, on the 6th day always.

I. The Epiphany, according to the Armenians, changes

¹ Arm. has Makaterion.

its date every four years.¹ And how this comes to be must be explained, and why it is not adjusted to [the dates] of other nations; this I will explain according to the order of the calendar. But many ask why was not the day of the holy Epiphany made clear? On what number of day of the month it falls, and we keep it, I will explain.

We have a tradition from the holy fathers. Inasmuch as it happened on the 20th day of the month, on the same day we also keep festival; the reason of which is this, That the feast of the holy Epiphany is no Jewish feast, but a Christian one only. And since there was no need to separate it from any other [feast],² it was not fixed in a regular manner, nor was the day [of the week] signified; but it was fixed by reference to the number of the day in the month on which it occurred. But some have declared about the day [of the week] of the holy Epiphany that it happened on a Friday, because on Friday was the creation of the first man; and others assert on the Sabbath. But I am persuaded by the holy Polycarp, for he was a pupil of John the Evangelist, and heard with his own ears all the history of the Saviour. And he declares that the birth happened on the first of the week. And it was fitting that on this day on which was the beginning of creation—it was indeed portended—that on this day the Saviour of all should come into the world by being born, but keeping the virginity intact. And [he said] that the resurrection after the stay under the seal of the rock [was on the first day of the week], as also prior to that the entrance into Jerusalem on the day of the palms, and subsequently thereto the

¹ The Armenian year contained 365 days only, or one quarter of a day less than the solar year. Consequently any day of any one month in this year of the Julian era will coincide with the day preceding it after a lapse of four years. *E.g.* the 4th June this year will answer to the 3rd June four years hence. For the Armenian calendar gains one day in four years upon the Julian.

² As the Christian Easter was of set purpose altered from the 14th of Nisan, the date of the Jewish Passover.

descent of the Spirit on the Apostles. But he (*i.e.* Polycarp) declared that the day of the baptism fell, after thirty years, on the same number of day in the month, only on the fourth day of the week. And he declares that the creation of the sun on the fourth day was for a mystery and foretype.¹ From the fourth tribe of Israel was the Saviour born, according to the Apostle, [who says] that from the tribe of Judah sprang our Lord. And because we feast both events on one day of the month, it was impossible to declare the day [of the week], because they (*i.e.* particular week days) fall, one on one day in the month, another on another.² But we keep the number of the day of the month;³ and for seven days we purify ourselves and fast before it, and on whatever day [*i.e.* of the week] it falls, we feast seven days after it. For God is not limited by time or power of days, according to the Lord's utterance, that the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.

¹ The citation of Polycarp seems to end here.

² *I.e.*, if the 20th day of a particular month is a Friday in one year, it need not be Friday in another.

³ Ananias implies—though he does not expressly say it—that Polycarp put the Nativity on the 20th day of a month, which was a Sunday; and exactly thirty years later, also on the 20th day of the same month, but on a Wednesday, the baptism.

The resurrection, the entry into Jerusalem, and the day of Pentecost, according to the same authority, all these occurred on the first day of the week, herein agreeing with the Syriac "Teaching of the Apostles."

Ananias omits to say which of the Armenian months it was on the 20th of which the Epiphany fell.

THE PLACE OF ABRAHAM IN RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

“I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgement; to the end that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him.”—GENESIS xviii. 19.

I HAVE already endeavoured to illustrate the great place of Abraham in the religious history of the human race, and have also discussed the great proof of his faith in his willingness to sacrifice Isaac at the command of the Eternal.¹

Monotheism—faith in one living God—wherever it exists, may be traced back historically to him. There has been a mere philosophical belief in the unity of the Supreme outside the historic movement which began with Abraham, but a real, effective, religious faith in one God is found only in Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. Judaism was the faith of Abraham’s descendants; Christianity is the flower and ultimate aim of Judaism; Mohammedanism is a composite religion, composed in part of Jewish and in part of Christian elements. All three have their roots in the father of the faithful.

But in his own home, and in the country where he fed his flocks and herds, Abraham did not stand alone as a worshipper of the one Supreme God. His faith was shared by Melchizedek, who is described as “priest of God most High,” and whose priesthood Abraham himself acknowledged by receiving his blessing and giving him a tithe of the spoil which he had taken from the four kings. A few centuries later a Monotheistic faith was still found in the same country: Balaam was not only a worshipper of the Supreme, he was an inspired prophet.

How was it that neither Melchizedek nor Balaam came

¹ EXPOSITOR, June and July, 1896.

to hold the place in the religious history of mankind that belongs to Abraham? Melchizedek passes across the dim and remote past—a solitary, mysterious figure; is seen but for a moment, and then completely vanishes: he leaves behind him, as far as we know, not a single heir of his faith. Balaam emerges as suddenly, but remains in sight for a little longer: an intense light is thrown upon the strange conflict in him of good and evil—the co-existence of the highest spiritual gifts with the lowest and most ignoble cravings for mere material good. The covetous prophet is a dark riddle and an awful warning to all ages: but he, too, vanishes; and he, too, like Melchizedek, leaves behind not a single heir of his faith.

What is the explanation of the difference between these men and Abraham? How are we to account for the enduring power of his faith and the transitoriness of theirs?

At first sight they seem to have the advantage of him, and to be far more likely than he to have the glory of originating a great religious movement in the history of the race. Melchizedek was priest of the most high God, and tradition represents him as being also a king. Balaam had the gift of prophecy, and spoke with singular beauty and force. Abraham had no such shining gift; he did not possess that poetic genius and natural eloquence which, blended with the vision of the thoughts of God, distinguished the great prophets, and of which Balaam had his share; nor did what appears to have been the priestly sanctity of Melchizedek belong to him. He was the chief of a wandering tribe—of such a tribe as a traveller may still see at any time in the Sinaitic desert. He was occupied with his flocks, his herds, and his household. He had his times of leisure, as men still have who live the wandering life of the Bedouin; but he had many cares, and his time was largely spent in the most ordinary secular business. He was not a missionary, as some one has said, and

does not seem to have had the kind of power that would have made him a missionary. He looked after his affairs; he grew rich; and then he died.

How unlike he is both to the founders of great religions and to the great reformers of religions which have sunk into decay! how unlike Sakya-Muni, for example, the founder of Buddhism, as represented in the well-known legend! How unlike St. Francis, St. Bernard, Luther, Wesley, Whitfield!

In the external conditions of his life he was a most ordinary man. He lived the common life of his countrymen of that age. Nor was he exempt from the infirmities of ordinary men. When the fulfilment of the divine promise seemed delayed, he endeavoured to get it fulfilled in his own way, and had a child by Hagar, Sarah's maid. That failure of faith brought on himself trouble and shame, and the Ishmaelites, the descendants of the child of his unbelief, were a trouble to the descendants of Isaac for centuries. Twice he told a falsehood to protect himself and Sarah when he was the guest of neighbouring kings. It is a very human figure—this of Abraham: he stands on the common earth; he is no ascetic, no priest, no prophet; and to the common mind he is no saint.

How did it come to pass that he achieved such unique greatness?

The text seems to give the explanation. He was elect of God—partly, no doubt, because of the wonderful depth and power of his own faith; a faith which indeed had its vicissitudes of weakness and strength, but which, though now and then it yielded, bore through a long life a constant and severe strain, became stronger as he grew older, and met sublimely the supreme test of all when he was required to sacrifice his son. But the power of his own faith is not the only explanation. There was that in him which made it certain that he would “command his children and

his household after him ” “ that they might keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgement.”

Faith in the Living God was not to be propagated by mere preaching—by inducing an individual here and there to forsake his old gods and to worship the Supreme. It was to be lodged in an organized society ; to be maintained and defended by the institutions and the customs and the public opinion of that society ; it was to become a tradition, moulding the thought and life of successive generations of men. In his own household—that is, in all the men and women that belonged to his tribe and over whom he ruled, a company of perhaps a thousand persons, and more, for we are told that he had three hundred and eighteen men trained to arms who had been born in his tents,—in all this great company his own faith in the supreme God worked with such energy that they gave up worshipping inferior divinities. They were Monotheists as he was. This, indeed, was only in harmony with the prevailing customs of those ancient times. Each family, each tribe, each nation held together as a matter of course in its religious faith and customs. But a chief of inferior vigour to Abraham might have been unable to restrain his people from yielding to the strong attractions of the neighbouring forms of idolatry. It was Abraham’s distinction—and this was, no doubt, largely the ground of his election—that he exercised such complete ascendancy over his household that they all consented to stand apart—as he stood apart—from the common idolatries of their country and their age.

Before Isaac, who was to succeed him, was born, the power of Abraham’s faith had, I suppose, penetrated and moulded the whole tribe, so that Isaac from his childhood breathed the atmosphere and was surrounded by the customs of a Monotheistic people. It was not his father alone that worshipped the Eternal, but the men that pitched the

tents, and looked after the camels and the cattle and the sheep, and who were trained to defend the lives and the property of the tribe from their plundering neighbours; and the women, too, were Monotheistic, who ground the corn, and prepared the meat, and cared for all the simple needs of a Bedouin household. As the tribe grew, the worship of the living and supreme God grew with it; until at last the tribe became a nation, and in that nation, notwithstanding its perpetual tendency to idolatry, the faith of Abraham was too firmly rooted to be ever wholly destroyed.

And so the history of Abraham in more ways than one is a striking illustration of the extent to which men depend upon each other for even the greatest gifts of God. The blessings which God sends us do not all come direct from heaven, but through innumerable human channels. They do not all descend upon us like rain—straight from the sky; but the rain feeds the springs, and it is from the springs that we draw our water; the rain falls on the hill sides and drains down into the rivers and lakes, and from the rivers and lakes we fill the reservoirs in which are treasured the supplies that save great cities from perishing of thirst. And so great religious gifts come to us—some of them no doubt direct from God, but many through the ministry of men.

To Abraham's faith we trace the faith of all the races of mankind that worship one living and true God. But it is not through Abraham alone that the revelation of the Supreme comes to us. Abraham's faith had to be lodged first in Abraham's family, or it would have passed away without producing any lasting effect on the history of the race. When the family grew into a nation, the faith had to be expressed and defended by the institutions and by the laws, by the customs, by the traditions, by the social and economic order of the State. And when the great trust passed from Judaism to Christianity, still it was not left to

the precarious protection of individual men; if it had been, it would soon have disappeared: it was committed to churches—to organized bodies of Christian men, who were to be disciplined and instructed by public teachers, who were to maintain public worship, and who were to give form and power to their faith by a special type of character—the growth and creation in part of the Christian Society, as well as of the Spirit of God and of the truths and laws, the memories and hopes which belong to the Christian gospel.

Many of us, I fear, have a most inadequate conception of the necessity of the communion of saints and the institution of worship to the growth of religious knowledge, of personal righteousness, power of service, and joy in God. We think that we can live a Christian life isolated and alone, making no confession of our faith, and keeping apart from all close association with Christian people. This error is a grave one, and may prove fatal. Imagine the kind of character that is formed in a corresponding isolation from general society. Imagine a child—growing up, not in a family, but in solitude; sufficiently cared for to keep it alive, but with its intellect and affections undeveloped by free intercourse with its kind; having no brothers or sisters or playfellows, no father or mother,—none to draw out its confidence and its love. Or imagine a man living, not in society, but in a desert—with books if you like, but with no living friends near or remote—none with whom he ever speaks or who ever speak to him, none to whom he ever writes or who ever write to him, working alone, resting alone, and sharing no man's sorrow or gladness. He misses more than half the strength and nearly all the joy of life, and grace and beauty of character are quite impossible to him.

But a man who lives in religious solitude, suffers similar loss but of a graver kind. The chances are that if his

faith in God does not perish it will be feeble; he will learn very little of religious truth from religious books, for the faculty which apprehends religious truth will be feeble; he will have no exulting joy in the consciousness of his own redemption; he will have little or no power to render religious service to others. The story of Abraham reminds us that the great blessings which we receive from the love of God do not come to us direct from heaven, but through human channels: in Abraham and his seed all nations were to be blessed: the Jewish nation was to be the organ through which the grace of God was to reach all mankind.

What we call the solidarity of mankind—the living organic interdependence of men upon each other—as opposed to what is called individualism, is impressively illustrated in the position of Abraham and his relations to the religious history of the world. And yet the principle of individualism was also impressively illustrated in Abraham's history.

In the early ages of human history the suppression of the individual was almost complete. The family—which included not only a man's own children but their children, and also his slaves,—the family, not the individual, was the unit of ancient societies. To the individual the law was almost indifferent; it defended the rights and assumed the loyalty, not of the individual but of the family. Property in Abraham's time was the property of the tribe and was held by the chief as the representative of the tribe. And as a man had no private property in material wealth but only shared the use of it with his tribe, so even his life belonged to his tribe rather than to himself. And in times much later than those of Abraham, and under forms of civilization much more advanced, the individual had no rights against the State, while the authority and power of the State over the individual citizen were unlimited and supreme.

Under these conditions it was not easy for a man to realize what we call his individual and personal responsibility. The individual was but a limb of the body—a branch of the tree: he might seem even less than this, and be nothing more than a ripple on the stream of the life of his tribe, a passing wave on the ocean of the life of his nation.

How have we come to that vivid sense of possessing a personal and individual life which is present wherever the Christian gospel is received, and apart from which Christian righteousness is impossible?

The late Dean of St. Paul's, in an interesting series of sermons, attempts to answer that question, and in answering it he has something to say about Abraham. It seemed to Dean Church that what we call the Christian character—the specific form of moral and religious excellence which is illustrated with more or less completeness in all Christian men, and which every Christian man, so far as he is loyal to Christ, is striving to attain—is not a type of goodness which in all its elements was unknown before the Incarnation. He regards it—to quote his own words—as “the result and outgrowth of all that series of events of which the Bible is in part, but the most important part, the record.” “The Bible,” he says, “exhibits it in various stages, in various forms—not always perfect, yet always going on to what is higher and purer, and shows (it) to us at last, after the passage of so many ages and generations, so many efforts and failures and slow steps of progress, in its finished and flawless perfection in the Person of the Divine Son of man.”

This means that the Christian character in its completeness was not suddenly and without preparation exhibited in Christ, but that we can trace what might be called its development through a succession of inferior types of righteousness and sanctity, as the biologist can trace the

development of the higher from the lower types of vegetable and animal life. The Christian theologian believes that this development from the very first was the manifestation of the presence and power of Christ in human thought and endeavour and achievement; but that in harmony with the general laws of the divine action the ascent from perfection to perfection was gradual. One great element and power of the Christian character appeared in Abraham; another appeared under the discipline of the law; another in the time of Isaiah and the great prophets.

The principle is in substance profoundly true, and gives great interest to the whole of the history of the religious life of the Jewish race. I am not clear, however, that I can agree with Dean Church in what he describes as the special contribution of that stage of God's discipline which we witness in the patriarchs, and especially in Abraham, to the formation of the religious character which was to be at last "the mind of Christ." For to Dean Church, this contribution consists in the idea of the singleness and individuality of the soul in its relation to the God who called it into being,—the singleness, the solitariness of the human soul, compared with all other things in the world about it; its independence and its greatness.

It is true that this great idea,—the idea of individualism in religion,—received an impressive prominence in the life and history of Abraham; but I should hesitate to assign to it the first place. It seems to me to be secondary in Abraham's history to the great idea of faith in the living and true God, and of unreserved obedience to Him; and, further, as I have attempted to show, Abraham's position and his relation to the human race illustrate, in the most striking and impressive manner, the opposite principle of the solidarity of mankind—of our dependence on each other, even in the highest provinces and activities of life.

And yet what Dean Church says has a very large measure

of truth in it. While the element of faith in the one living and supreme God was the great contribution of Abraham to the development of the Christian character, the necessary result of his faith was a profound sense of his separate and immediate relation to God, and of his direct responsibility to God; and this involved a vivid sense of his own individual personality.

To him, separately and apart from all the rest of mankind, the revelation of God had come; to him, separately and apart from all the rest of mankind, the great promise of God had been given; on him, separately and apart from all the rest of mankind, had been imposed the duty—to him had come the glory—of asserting the awful supremacy of the Eternal. He had to break away from the race to which he belonged, to leave the country where he had lived from his childhood, to go out not knowing whither he went. He must fulfil his trust; he must stand by what he now knew concerning God, against the world.

And how lonely his knowledge of the great future of his descendants must have made him! We cannot doubt that he thought constantly of the wonderful mystery that in him—in them—all nations were to be blessed; he lived under the power of this amazing discovery; and it must have separated him by an immeasurable distance from all the rest of mankind. He was the heir of a solitary and most mysterious greatness.

And whenever a man begins to discover that the Eternal God is near to him—that day by day, in his thoughts, in his words, in his temper, in his wishes, in his actions, he is giving account of himself to God, and that from God Himself, not merely from the action of unconscious and necessary laws, he will receive at last the things done in the body; when a man learns that there is a law of God which he has to obey, and that he may have the grace of God in order to obey it, he is at once detached from the

crowd, stands apart and alone, charged with the awful responsibility of determining his own character and destiny.

His sin, it is his own; the guilt of it is his. However fiercely he was tempted, it was he and not another who was assailed; he and not another who fell under the assault. If he is to be forgiven, he himself must venture, without any human comradeship or support, into the presence of God, must appeal to God's mercy, and obtain God's pardon. The great life he has to live—the life which is to be the fulfilment of God's own thought and purpose—is a life not governed by common motives or formed by common traditions; it is a life apart, inspired by the power of God's infinite love for him, and directed by God's supreme authority—a life with its secret but infinite hopes, its secret but infinite delights; and it must be his own life. He has to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, for God is working in him both to will and work of His own good pleasure.

There is no vigorous and effective religious life until a man is thus separated from the whole race, from the whole universe, and finds himself alone with God; and yet not alone, for that would be awful for a sinner: he is in Christ—and so the awe and the dread pass into a great joy.

Yes, it is a great and critical hour in the history of a man when he is drawn aside from the crowd and stands alone in the presence of the Eternal, and when the awful question comes to him whether he will confront all that is implicated in his own independent personality and take up the burdens which it imposes upon him. He is involved, no doubt, in the common imperfection and sin of his race; he has inherited tendencies to many forms of moral evil, and he has been environed by conditions unfriendly to moral perfection; and yet he—he himself—is responsible for conduct and character. He is free, however limited the range of freedom. The tendencies to evil which he has

inherited—has he struggled against them? The environment hostile to perfection—has he endeavoured to resist its malignant influence? Does he submit to the condemnation of conscience—the condemnation of God, which attaches guilt to him individually, for basely yielding to these evil tendencies and powers instead of collecting all his forces to do battle with them? Is he prepared now to make it the supreme work of life to attempt, with whatever ill success, to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with his God? Will he stand alone against all the forces of evil that are dragging him to shame and ruin, stand alone in his attempt to achieve a perfect righteousness?

There is a salvation common to the race. He lives in a redeemed world. The Son of the Eternal has died for him, that he may have the pardon of sin and the very life of God. Will he—he himself—grasp the infinite gifts of God's mercy? will he make them his own, not relying on any church or ministry, on any gracious influences that may come upon him from without, but acting on the discovery that it is for him—for him separately and alone—to trust in the divine grace and to work out his own salvation? If he responds to this appeal, with him it is well—well with him in this life, and it will be well through the endless ages that are his inheritance in Christ. He has come to himself, as the prodigal did; and a man must come to himself if he is to come to God.

Whatever contributes to expel this sense of personality, whatever merges the individual in the race, is hostile at once to a noble morality and to a deep religious faith. The dying words of M. Renan are an impressive illustration of the extent to which, in our times, the moral suppression of the individual is possible. "Be calm," he said to his wife, "be resigned. We undergo the laws of that nature of which we are a manifestation. We perish, we disappear; but heaven and earth remain, and the march of time goes

on for ever." Foam bubbles on the tossing sea of life, appearing and vanishing, though the sea continues to toss for thousands of generations. Leaves on the great tree of life, which through year after year strikes its roots deep into the earth and flings its mighty branches higher into the heavens,—leaves which are the manifestations of the nature of the tree,—appear in the spring and fall in the autumn according to the eternal laws. Foam-bubbles, leaves,—nothing more! If that is true, farewell, not only to the glory of all religious hope, but to all moral heroism. Suppress the personality of man, his ethical freedom, his life, which is blended no doubt with the life of the race, but is a life secret, separate and apart from the race, his own—in a most awful sense his own; suppress his direct and personal relations to the Eternal, bind him inseparably, for good or evil, to the race to which he belongs; let his character be nothing more than the manifestation of a life common to mankind, instead of having stamped upon it the impress of his own freedom; let his destiny, for glory or shame, for eternal life or eternal death, be the destiny of his race, independent altogether of his own personal choice and his own personal conduct, and the roots of all lofty righteousness and of all generous love, whether for God or man, are destroyed; man is unsceptred, uncrowned, descends from his rank as created to be a child of God, and passes into a lower order, takes his place among the mere mechanic forces of the universe; his kinship to the Eternal is lost and all the glory of his nature quenched.

The vivid sense of personality—this is essential to ethics and to religion: Abraham's example proves that it is not inconsistent with a vivid sense of our dependence on each other and of the solidarity of the race.

R. W. DALE.

HERMON.

THE most conspicuous object in the whole landscape of Syria and Palestine is Mount Hermon. It was a landmark to all the Patriarchs in their wanderings. All the holy men who wrote the books of the Bible gazed on its massive outlines. It was the most familiar feature on the horizon of our blessed Lord as He went about doing good. Day by day, and hourly, He gazed on the pale snowy cone as He wandered among the hamlets of Galilee, or through the cities of Decapolis, or by the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. It towered above Him in majestic grandeur as He approached Cæsarea Philippi, and it crouched beneath His feet on the night of the Transfiguration.

Mount Hermon stands on a base line about twenty miles in length, and rises to an altitude of nearly 10,000 feet. The Antilebanon range, which sinks into the level plain at Emesa and Palmyra, culminates at its south-western extremity in this massive buttress, which, like a sentinel, has looked down on the human events by which sacred history has been built up.

Scarcely a doubt has ever been raised as to the identification of Hermon. In the days of Jerome an attempt was made to locate it where *Jebel ed-Duhy* now stands, near to Mount Tabor, with a view to the better understanding of Psalm lxxxix. 12. The identification was a guess made in a cave. It had no traditional or scientific basis, and it is only to be heard of in monasteries, and other abodes of darkness.

To Joshua and his warriors Hermon stood as the northern boundary of their conquests—"From the river Arnon unto Mount Hermon" (Deut. iii. 8; Josh. xii. 1). It stood by "the valley of Lebanon under Mount Hermon" (Josh. xi. 17), and it was in close proximity to Bashan, the half-tribe of Manasseh extending in their prosperity to its base

(1 Chron. v. 23). From these indications there can be no doubt that Hermon the *Sacred* is the mountain that we now know as Jebel esh-Sheikh, the *Chief* or *Ancient* mountain.

Hermon is true to its modern name. Like an aged sheikh, it towers with its snowy locks over the other mountains that cling to its base for strength and protection. Its chief features suggest age, strength, supremacy. We shall study its claim further on to the name Hermon the Sacred.

I propose in this paper to take my reader over Hermon as it is, and to point out some of the associations, secular and sacred, that cling to it, and to the scenes around it. I ought to have admitted qualifications for the pleasant task. I built two churches on the sides of the mountain; I had my home for a time on one of its spurs. I explored all its recesses, and alone and in company I spent a score of nights on its summit. I am, therefore, familiar with all its phenomena.

Perhaps the phenomenon of most hallowed association to the memory and imagination of the Christian scholar is the little cloud that hangs over the mountain. A name by which the mountain is often referred to is Jebel eth-Thalj, *the snowy mountain*. The air passing over the snowy summit becomes condensed, and a thin, white cloud is perpetually forming and perpetually being dispersed. This remembrancer of the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5) scene is said to linger on the mountain top two-thirds of the year. In 1869 I had the mountain carefully watched during the months of August and September, and the cloud was only absent four days at the end of September, when the snow had all disappeared, and a great thunderstorm was brewing. Few days pass in June or July without the pillar of cloud appearing on the mountain top. I have watched it for hours as I rode round the base of the mountain, or sat on the roof of my house. It often seemed a tongue of flame

which the wind was extinguishing, but it always flickered back to its full force.

No traveller in Bible lands should pass through without ascending Mount Hermon. A good horse will take him easily to the top. A common nag will bring him within a thousand feet of the summit. The whole journey can be accomplished easily on foot, and there is no danger whatever.

The first part of the journey will be through tilled fields, out of which the villagers have gathered the stones. Vineyards are cultivated to a height of between four and five thousand feet. Above these the traveller will pass through a belt of small mountain oak, with wild almonds, plums, pears, and cherries, beautiful for their blossoms in Spring and their berries in Autumn. Small junipers abound, and higher there are tussocks of prickly shrubs which look soft as velvet from a distance, but each is armed with a thousand spears as sharp as needles.

The great mass of the mountain is limestone, with occasional outcrops of basalt, especially on the lower western slopes, as if in sympathy with the volcanic regions of Bashan. The mountain becomes barer of vegetation the higher we ascend, and the last 700 feet is covered with disintegrated limestone, which the snow and frost, the freezing and thawing, have detached from the hard rock. This loose shingle, several inches deep, on the smooth rock, always slips from under the feet, and forms the chief difficulty of the ascent.

Hermon, looked at from a distance or from its base, seems to culminate in a sharp ridge of several elevations. On making the ascent, however, the summit is found to consist of a tolerably level space, four or five hundred yards from edge to edge. It is an irregular angular field, such as are common in the highlands of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.

Around this field there is a jagged, broken fence of rocks which rises into little peaks on the northern and southern sides. Here and there, where the plateau is not supported by its rocky rim, it slopes down gently to the steep edge of the mountain, and on the western edge it breaks down about 100 feet to a point where two ravines from either side of the mountain meet. From this point the mountain rises again to within 100 feet of the same height as the northern and southern peaks. Still further west the mountain sinks and rises again in many a crested wave till it reaches the Hüleh Plain at Banias (Cæsarea Philippi).

The western peak is called Mutabkhiyet, from the cooking of storms that goes on about it. It is distant from the plateau and the other peaks six or seven hundred paces, and as it is separated from them by a considerable dip in the mountain, the level plateau with its two crowns may be considered the real summit.

The three peaks, and others of lesser altitude, may supply the key to the plural name in Psalm xlii. 6: "Therefore do I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons" (הַרְמוֹנִים, *Hermounîm*).

Having taken a hasty survey of the general outlines of the summit, we look for the "*insigne templum*," which Jerome had heard of, but had not seen, on the top. The ruins, which are considerable, cluster round the southern peak. The rock, which is about eighteen feet high, is cut and scarped in several places, doubtless for sacrificial purposes, like the temple rock in Jerusalem. There is a ring of stones round the base of the rock, and as the rock, like Hermon itself, is longer than broad, the ring is oval or elliptical, its greatest diameter being about forty-three paces, and its least about thirty-three. The stones of the circle, which are well dressed and laid end to end on the uneven stony surface, are some of them eight feet long, and several of them on the inner side are still in their original

positions. On the outer side, where the circle is broken, there are indications that the ring was once complete. There seems to have been only one course of stones, and though a good deal of care was given to their dressing, very little was bestowed on the placing of them, the foundation having been left uneven.

South-west of the circle, and partly on the scarped rock, there is the remains of a temple. It was constructed of well-dressed stones, and was nearly square, its length being twelve paces and its breadth eleven. The temple is now in ruins, but there is no difficulty in tracing its outline, although the stones in some cases have been used for smaller structures, probably by shepherds, and many of them have rolled down the mountain.

There is no ground for the theory that the ring of stones encircling the rock is of greater antiquity than the temple, for the dressing of the stones is of the same period and excellence. There are the remains of a circle of unhewn stones down the mountain to the west. It forms a kind of breast work, and may be of any age. The ornamentation, however, of the stones of the temple appears to be of the same period as that of the Greek temples on the Barada, and around Hermon. The temple opened towards the east, and was visible south and east to a great distance, and as its walls were probably covered with brazen plates, like the temples of Baalbek and Abila, it must have been a striking sight each morning as it blazed like a diadem on the white brow of the great mountain.

There is little doubt that Hermon was once a centre of Baal-worship. Each insignificant village in the neighbourhood of the mountain had a great temple, and some of them more than one. Some of these temples were of beautiful form and workmanship. They grew up in the palmy days of Roman rule. Herod erected, at the base of Hermon, a beautiful white marble temple in honour of Cæsar Augustus.

Josephus has preserved for us the story of this temple of Cæsarea Philippi. Nothing is known of the builders of the other temples, but their record remains in the splendid sanctuaries to Baal, the god of the great mountain, whose *Haram*, or *Hermon*, it was.

Ancient Rome, like modern Rome, had a genius for assimilating the deities with which she came in contact, and while the splendid temples that rose around and on Hermon, about the beginning of our era, were shrines of Baal to the Hermonites, they were to the Romans temples of Jupiter, the supreme god of the ever victorious legions. In the wall of one of the temples of Rukbley that faced Hermon there is a splendid human face. To the natives the radiated head was the sun-god Baal; to the Romans it was the majestic Zeus.

The scene that lay around Hermon, visible from the temple, was of such surpassing interest that one grudged the time to look minutely into the details of the barren plateau. The civilizing Mediterranean lapped the Phœnician coast far down in the distance, and yet it seemed so near that one might sling a pebble over the edge into it. Tyre jutted out into the sea at the spot where the setting sun burnished a broad streak on the waters. Down that coast by the white promontory the hosts of the Pharaohs and Alexander and other warriors went and came, and as they sweltered under their heavy armour they turned wistful eyes to the snow-clad mountain from which we gazed down. An indistinct heap marks Akka, where great Richard and Saladin contended for the mastery, where the Crusaders made their last feeble stand, and where the great Napoleon's star first paled before British skill and valour.

The convent of Carmel is distinctly visible on the seaward extremity, and we can mark the very spot where Elijah wrought such havoc among Jezebel's ritualists.

The waving hills of Nazareth, the cone of Tabor, the white dome in Tiberias, the distant hills of Gilboa stood before us with their crowding memories. That deep rent down the length of the land is the Jordan. The silvery stream flows through the placid pond Merom, down the deep gorge fringed with oleanders. It sparkles in Genesareth, and stagnates in the Dead Sea, that type of the selfish who receive and do not give, and in all its strange and serpentine course it is taken in by one glance from the top of Hermon.

We looked down on the highland of Bashan, and, as the setting sun struck aslant the mouths of extinct volcanoes, we seemed to be gazing down their very throats. The whole Damascene lay like a level sea-bed from which the water had just retreated, and here and there green island-like patches marked the sites of villages. Damascus seemed a small speck on the edge of the plain among the roots of the mountains. To the north we could mark the wavy folds of Lebanon, and as the evening advanced, violet and lilac shadows, thrown on the dull chocolate mountains, produced a picture never to be forgotten.

While busied with the secular and sacred associations of the scene around Hermon, the natural history of the place should not be overlooked. The birds most plentiful were Persian larks, stone-chatters and red-starts. Red-billed choughs were numerous, and ravens and vultures and hawks were common. I secured several hares near the summit, and as the red-legged partridges came to a fountain down the mountain to the west I got as many as we wanted. A superb lady butterfly became the subject of an exciting chase, but it made its escape. During the twilight several birds flew over us, and one which I secured by a random shot proved to be a goat-sucker (*caprimulgus*).

On one occasion I invited a number of Hermonites to

join me in a pic-nic on the top of the mountain. Twenty-five men and one woman came. They brought with them a great red-eyed, shaggy he-goat that would have served as a splendid specimen of a scape-goat. He was brought as a substitute for a promised lamb that I had paid for, and as the wild-looking man dragged him past me he seemed more suited for a picture than for the pot. He looked as if he would prove a *pièce de résistance*.

The large-boned, powerful mountaineers had spent all their lives high up on Hermon, and only two out of the twenty-five had ever before stood on its summit. They were hungry after their climb, and proceeded immediately to make ready for the feast.

The goat was slaughtered in the temple of Baal, where the ashes and bones of many a victim strewed the ground. Immediately the animal was slain the men gathered eagerly around the carcass. Supposing they were examining the viscera for omens, I joined the party and found them greedily devouring the raw, warm flesh, which was still quivering with lingering life. They gave me to understand that meat was generally eaten raw in the Hermon villages.

As the sun sank towards the Mediterranean, a great pyramidal shadow of Hermon began to extend on the eastern side of the mountain, and it grew and stretched out until its apex touched Damascus. We watched the setting sun, expecting it to sink at the distant horizon of the ocean, but instead, to the amazement of all, it seemed to drop seething into the middle of the sea. We witnessed a similar phenomenon on the following morning, when the sun, instead of coming from behind the eastern horizon, started up fiery red from what seemed to be the middle of the plain of Damascus.

The traveller, if possible, should spend a night on Hermon. When the sun set, the silent night drew its curtains

quickly around us. The moon was in Scorpio, Vega was in our zenith, and the great stars hung down out of the blue like lamps of fire.

Some of my companions took refuge in a cave excavated in the plateau, the roof of which was sustained by a central column of the living rock that had not been removed. Others stretched themselves on the bare ground with stones for their pillows, and all were soon audibly asleep.

I looked round on the wild-looking men strewn around me. We lay on the real Mount of Transfiguration, possibly on the very spot where the Saviour slept, with Peter and James and John, on the night before the representatives of the Law and the Prophets, Moses and Elias, committed to Him their trusts.

The Elder Brother himself slept on that bare mountain top. The thick dews of Hermon saturated His locks. He was then bracing Himself for the accomplishment of the great Redemption for which He had taken upon Himself the form of a servant, and he needed and received the sympathy of the beatified. It was a thought to repose upon that the memory of that night was still fresh with the Saviour, and that He looked down upon us as we slept.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

*THE CONCEPTION OF CHRIST SUGGESTED TO
A HEATHEN INQUIRER BY PAUL'S EARLIEST
EXTANT WRITING.*

A STUDY IN 1 THESSALONIANS.

IN every age there have been sincere souls, peculiarly dear to God, who have turned their faces steadily toward the light; and in the early days of the gospel we may well believe there were many such amongst the heathen; seekers they were after truth, who looked to the new teaching with

something more than a mere Athenian curiosity; they hoped to find in it some sort of answer to their painful longings for light and peace.

One can conceive of a man of this order at Thessalonica. He would have nothing to do, one may suppose, with the sensuous worship and wild orgies which claimed so many votaries amongst his fellow-countrymen. Theologically, if such a term be allowed in this connection, such an one may have admitted that there were lesser deities, he might even not have been unwilling to sacrifice a cock to Æsculapius; but for all that he would hold that there was a Supreme Being, a God-Father, of whom—in some mysterious way—this world was an emanation, or to whom it was as a vesture in which He at once revealed and hid Himself. He would believe, further, that this great Being was not wholly indifferent to human life and character, and that in some way or other, how he could not define, he and all men would have to render an account to Him. He might have felt, further, that human nature needed mending, and may have looked more to philosophy than to religion, as he understood it, to do this great service. Yet, after all, his would be but a thin creed to live by, a sort of twilight that revealed objects and yet confused their outline. It supplied little guidance for practical life, and it made death a fearful leap in the dark.

Such an one had come across the Apostle Paul at Thessalonica, and his interest had been aroused, both by what that teacher of a new religion was and by what he had to say. He knew, for instance, that the Jews, in a general way, had no particular liking for the Gentiles, as they called all who were not of their nation; and he knew, further, that the strictly religious Jews were intensely exclusive, it being apparently part of their religion that they should separate themselves from all other peoples. He had been given to understand that they were stern Monotheists, believing in

one supreme God alone, so that they could scarcely frame language strong enough in which to denounce the lords many and the gods many of the Gentile world. And yet, here was this man Paul, a Jew, and evidently in his own way a religious man, actually going in and out amongst the Thessalonians as though he were one of themselves, and speaking strange words about one Jesus, who had been dead, and who—so he said—had risen from the grave and was then alive, and able to help men to lead good lives.

And whilst most of those who had taken Paul for their teacher were plain people, and much of their talk sounded to this man like a mere superstition, yet this much was clear, that they were pure and upright in their conduct above the common, and they seemed to love one another as those do who are bound together by a supreme common interest.

Such facts as these, as our inquirer reflected upon them, would deepen his desire to know more. What was it all about? Above all, who was this Jesus Christ? But, meanwhile, Paul had left Thessalonica, and of him he can make no personal inquiries. Presently it comes to his knowledge that a letter has been received from the Apostle, who was then at Athens. It had already been in the hands of the leaders of the little community of Christians in the city, and was to be read in a meeting of the congregation. To this gathering he obtains access, that he may hear it for himself. Greatly interested and yet not a little perplexed, later he obtains a loan of the precious parchment, for it contained so many startling ideas that even his trained and eager mind cannot take them all in at once.

Keeping these perfectly natural suppositions before us, let us ask, What conception of Christ would such an one gain from Paul's communication? That communication was simple and uncontroversial, the Apostle is neither condemning an error, nor developing a truth; he is just saying

what his anxiety and love dictate. He does not argue for a position, but takes for granted the things which he had already communicated by word of mouth. For the most part, any statements about God and Christ and their relation to these people, are made by way of implication rather than of direct affirmation; they were already the common property of the writer and his friends. Thus the letter contained them in solution, as they were already received and understood. In this way it would enable our inquirer to know more of what may be called the common Christian mind than he could have gathered from some later and more elaborate letters from the same pen. In them sublime conceptions are developed as a counterpoise to growing errors of belief.

Turning over the letter, then, with his mind almost a *tabula rasa*—a clean page—what would he learn concerning Jesus Christ, as Paul therein set Him forth? Arranging the substance of the letter as it related to that great person in some sort of logical order, the first thing that he would discover would be that :

Christ was a historical Person; that is, He had actually lived in this world. If it had been looked for, His name might have been found in the official records of the Roman Government in Syria, for it was said that the Jews had killed Him (ii. 15); and if the Jews had killed Him, then, almost to a certainty, He must have been a public character, who in some way or other had become obnoxious to them. Here, perhaps, our friend, as he read the passage, may have thought of Socrates, and the way in which he had been done to death by the Athenians. At any rate, it was certain that Jesus Christ was not a mythical person, a phantom, but one who well within the knowledge of people then living had walked this earth, and not so long ago had died (iv. 14).

Of course, so far, there would be nothing extraordinary

in this, that Paul should go up and down speaking about a dead teacher, and promulgating his views: that was a proceeding with which every intelligent Greek was familiar. The singular thing was to follow. For if this Jesus had lived and died, it was further said of Him, as though it were a well-known fact, that:

He had risen from the dead. In one passage (i. 10) it is said that God raised Him up; and in another it is said simply (iv. 14) that He rose again. How He rose, what He was like, what had become of Him, of all this nothing was reported, but the statement was clear that Paul held, and these Thessalonians had received, that the dead Christ lived again. This was not asserted with passion, or with marks of admiration, but soberly, as when a man speaks of that which no one denies.

Here was something the like of which our inquirer had never heard of before. He had, doubtless, his ideas of a life after death, a dim and ghostly life, as of a disembodied shade; perhaps He had felt in rare moments of exaltation that man cannot really die, but here was something quite different from such thoughts; for when it was said Jesus died and rose again (iv. 14) it must have meant that the person who had gone down into the grave, came up out of it, an awful thought, which, if not met by blank incredulity, would be likely to strike terror into any who witnessed the dead one living. So at least this heathen would think.

And yet it would become increasingly plain, as the reader pondered over what he read, that this belief, that the dead had become alive again, was fundamental. For in this letter:

Christ is spoken of as One who stands in such a relation to men now in this world as is only possible between living persons. It was not simply such a relation as by the aid of tender and sacred memories we maintain with

dear ones who have gone before. Paul speaks of the Thessalonians as having become followers of us and of the Lord (i. 6), indicating that the Lord lived and could be followed, as he himself, in some humble way, could be followed too. He calls himself and his companions apostles, *i.e.*, messengers of Christ (ii. 6), as though sent out by a living authority. He calls the gospel the gospel of Christ (iii. 2) just as elsewhere he calls it the gospel of God (ii. 2), which phrase seems to show that Christ stood related to the message in a way only possible to one who was alive, and very much alive.

Nor is this by any means all: Christ is spoken of as able to exercise functions, which, it is commonly supposed, belong to God alone. Thus it could not escape the eye of the reader that the letter opens with this salutation, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ" (i. 1). Nor that later, when Paul is telling his friends how exceedingly he desires to see them again, he shapes his wish thus: "Now God Himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you" (iii. 11); and then goes on to say, "The Lord" (evidently meaning Christ) "make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men." Just as though Christ could actually lay His hand upon the secret hearts of men and change their tempers! And when the letter closes, it does so in this wise, "The grace" (*i.e.* mercy) "of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (v. 28), which would be a foolish and a meaningless ending unless He were alive and able in some way or other to alter men's lives by means of His mercy.

Here would be matter for astonished reflection on the part of our inquirer, for he must have known, if indeed he had any knowledge of such matters at all, that the Jews abhorred and detested any approach to a deification of mortal man. As a fairly informed person he might very

possibly have heard of the riotous proceedings at Jerusalem, which occurred because a foolish Roman Emperor set up his statue in the city, and desired divine honours to be paid to it; and he may have known that some of the most sacred Scriptures of the Jews were full of a fine scorn for the gods of Egypt and Assyria, of Philistia and of Tyre, not only because they were bestial, but because it was vainly imagined that they shared with Jehovah the attributes of deity. He knew these things, and yet here was Paul, a Jew, and proud that he was one, a keen, clear-headed man, actually speaking of Christ, whom the Jews had killed, as able, in a sort of co-partnery with the Father of all, to give grace and peace, and to direct the ways of men!

The reader's amazement would not be lessened as he took into his thought another series of passages in the letter he had before him. For if there is one idea more dominant in it than another, its ground idea, it is this, that:

Christ furnishes the sphere, the element, the atmosphere, in which men are said to live, and in which Paul, and even God Himself, work. The idea of men being in a supreme personality was probably not quite foreign to our inquirer's mind; he would have been ready to accept what Paul said to the wise men of Athens that in God we live and move and have our being, putting his own interpretation upon the words. It was not the idea itself that would have staggered him, but the present application of it to Christ, the same person who had lived in Syria and been killed by the Jews. But that it was applied to him in this letter, there could be no manner of doubt. Thus, the Church of the Thessalonians was said to be in the Lord Jesus Christ, as it was in God the Father (i. 1). The like is said of the Churches of Judea—they are in Christ Jesus (ii. 14). The conduct and moral character of the Christian

people were in Jesus Christ, for Paul says that he remembers continually their work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope, which were in our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 3). He held that his own exhortations were in the Lord Jesus (iv. 1), that fact gave them authority. The teachers of the Church were over them in the Lord (v. 12), and even the will of God was in Christ Jesus. "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you" (v. 18).

And not only does Christ dominate the whole field of life in this world, He is Master in that other world into which those who have died go. The dead are said to sleep in Jesus (iv. 14), they are the dead in Christ (iv. 16).

It may be said, without fear of contradiction, that this whole conception was a new thing to the Gentile inquirer, and a thing that would be likely to appal him. No teacher amongst his own people, in his wildest flights, had ever conceived that a person who had lived on this earth (and Paul had never hidden the lowly life that had been spent in Galilee and Judea) should so dominate all things, so penetrate all, so envelop all, as that men living and men dead could be said to be—in Him. And if he had inquired amongst the Jewish teachers, he would have found that such a conception was as alien to their minds as to his. Wherever Paul got it from, he did not get it by expanding and exaggerating an idea already to be found in germ in the faith of his fathers.

It would but give a rounded completeness to what he had already discovered, when the inquirer finds that Paul and his Christian friends in Thessalonica expected that Christ would come again to this world. What Paul called the coming of the Lord was a settled point in the great future toward which he looked. In his loving way he says that the people to whom he was writing were his hope and joy and crown of rejoicing, in the presence of the Lord Jesus

Christ at His coming (ii. 19). He hopes that their hearts will be established unblamable in holiness before God, even their Father, at the coming of their Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints (iii. 15). This same wish appears in another wording, when he says that his prayer for them is that they may be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ (v. 23).

Thus, then, as our Gentile inquirer read the letter, and reading, marked, learned, and inwardly digested its substance, such points as these would emerge. Jesus Christ had lived on this earth, He had died a violent death, and had risen from the grave; and, further, wherever He now was, He stood in such a relation to people in this world as is only possible to a living person, He exercises powers that are held to belong to the supreme God alone; He dominates all life, both in this world and in that world unseen into which the dead go, and one day He will come again, and human eyes shall see Him.

As he considered these things, would not the reader begin to ask:

Who is Jesus Christ, and why did He ever come to this world? To these final questions the answers given in the letter are brief, but they are sufficient. Near the beginning of it Paul says that everywhere people had recognised the great change that had come about in the lives of the Thessalonian Christians. They show these outsiders "what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned from idols to serve the living and true God"—so he writes; and then he adds a significant amplification—"and to wait for *His Son* from heaven, even Jesus" (i. 9, 10). That is, Jesus Christ was Son of God in such senses as are developed in the whole texture of the Epistle.

But if He were so great a One as to be Son of God, why did He die? How could it be possible that a Being so exalted, so powerful, so supreme, should ever suffer the ap-

palling ignominy of a violent death? To the man we have in mind, this would be a very serious question indeed, for he in his way was just as averse as was the Jew in his to the linking together of Deity and a cross; it would be foolishness unto him, an absurd *dénouement*, a transition from the sublime to the ridiculous, for to be weak was, in Greek eyes, to be ridiculous.

Why, then, did the Son of God die? Only one sentence in the whole letter supplies an answer to that critical question; but, short as it is, it is sufficient. *He died*, says Paul, *for us* (v. 10). This brief word is amplified a little by two other sayings. "God hath appointed us to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ" (v. 9), "Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come" (i. 10).

Would these answers satisfy the inquirer? Would they appear to him consonant with what had gone before? Would the whole conception of Christ hold together, or was it composed of irreconcilable fragments? Probably his own spiritual condition would give colour to his replies to these questions. But as a serious person of some intelligence, one or two things would surely suggest themselves to him.

The conception of Christ as one so completely man as to have been slain by rude hands, and yet as having risen from the dead, and as one possessed of powers active in the world, would be to him absolutely novel. He would be familiar with the idea of the gods coming down to this world in the likeness of men, paying short visits for their own purposes and then returning to Olympus. But there was really no point of contact between such apparitions and Jesus Christ. And as to a resurrection from the dead, it had never come into the mind of man in any such sense as it was affirmed of Jesus Christ. In his view, probably, the body was a sort of incumbrance, which in any future state of existence was to be got rid of. And as to the spiritual part of man, it could not be buried, and therefore

could not be raised from the dead; but it was said of Christ, that God raised Him from the dead. When the Athenians heard of this, and perhaps they heard of it at the very time that Paul's letter reached Thessalonica, they mocked.

If our inquirer had been as well acquainted with Jewish thought as we may suppose him to have been with Greek, then he would have found that in many particulars this conception of Christ raised from the dead was foreign to it too.

And then, further, this man must have been struck with the effect which belief in these statements, all taken together, had upon the Thessalonians and upon Paul himself; that effect was unmistakable and surprising. It had changed their lives, it had dissolved long-accepted and cherished beliefs, and it was, somehow or other, united with moral teaching of singular balance and sweetness. Was it not written, in this very letter, "We exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men; see that none render evil to any man, but ever follow that which is good both amongst yourselves and to all men" ? (v. 14, 15). Here was no wild, heady enthusiasm, but an outline of human conduct that would, if followed, change the world and bring on the golden age. And though they were by no means perfect, yet this was the pattern which these Thessalonian followers of Christ set before them. Thus the strange conception of Christ was linked in with decent, kindly, patient, and reasonable lives.

Whether this man would pursue his inquiries yet further, would very much depend upon his own personal sense of need as a moral being; for only then would his inquiries receive that intenser quality that comes from an awakened heart. The affections as well as the intellect must be engaged if men are to make the supreme quest.

We may permit ourselves to believe that he did receive Christ as One who died for him, who lived and exercised Divine powers. And though at that early stage he could not have said of Christ that "He was begotten before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made," yet he could have said—not going one inch beyond the teaching of this primitive Epistle—what implies and involves all these things, namely, that he had turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven, even Jesus, which delivereth us from the wrath to come, and that Christ died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with Him.

Nay, perhaps he could have gone farther, and said, "The life that I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

E. MEDLEY.

"DOUBLE FOR ALL HER SINS."

A CRITICAL EXPOSITION.

"She hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."—ISAIAH xi. 1.

"And that He would show thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is."—JOB xi. 6.

THESE ~~two~~ passages invite attention for two or three special reasons. They are the only passages in the sacred Scriptures in which the Hebrew word occurs which is here translated "double." The word referred to is, however, dual in form, and, in order to be perfectly exact, it is necessary to state that it occurs elsewhere in the singular, though in one passage only, namely, in Job the 41st chapter, 13th verse. The two passages, moreover, present special difficulties, the one a difficulty of reconciliation with the religious instinct of mankind; the other a diffi-

culty in deducing out of it any tolerable meaning, or, indeed, any meaning at all. It is noteworthy and suggestive that the difficulty in each case, though so diverse in character, gathers around the word "double." It is therefore not unnatural to hope that the key that will solve either of these difficulties will also solve the other, or to expect to find the desired key in a truer understanding of the word that is in these cases translated by the English word "double." If we can find a meaning for this word that is etymologically natural, if in the light of this meaning the difficulty vanishes from both passages alike, and if the illumination passes beyond these portions to other important portions of Scripture, we shall need no further evidence of the validity of our conclusions. To this end we have directed our thought, the results of which we now lay before our readers.

Let us first take under consideration the passage which we have cited from the commencement of the 40th chapter in the prophecies of Isaiah. Jerusalem is told that her warfare is accomplished and her iniquity is pardoned, because she hath received of the Lord's hand *double for all her sins*. Let us take one of the most recent as well as one of the strongest expositions of this verse. Professor George Adam Smith writes as follows: "The third clause is especially gracious. It declares that Israel has suffered of punishment more than double enough to atone for her sins. This is not a way of regarding either sin or atonement which, theologically speaking, is accurate. What of its relation to our Articles, that man cannot give satisfaction for his sins by the work of his hands or the pains of his flesh? No, it would scarcely pass some of our creeds to-day. But all the more, that it thus bursts forth from strict terms of dealing, does it reveal the generosity of Him who utters it. How full of pity God is, to take so much account of the sufferings sinners have brought upon themselves! How

full of grace to reckon those sufferings double the sins that had earned them! It is, as when we have seen gracious men make us a free gift, and in their courtesy insist that we have worked for it. It is grace masked by grace. As the height of art is to conceal art, so the height of grace is to conceal grace, which it does in this verse."

These words give us an excellent indication of the point which exposition has reached in dealing with this passage. If we start with the ordinary assumption that the words really mean that Israel had suffered of punishment *more than double enough to atone for her sins*, then the words quoted from Professor G. A. Smith are probably as good as anything that can be said upon the matter. We must take refuge in poetry, and in an all-four analogy between grace and art. But I confess that to me this best of explanations is far from being satisfactory. It neither successfully explains the passage, nor explains it away. I am not concerned about Professor Smith's difficulties respecting Articles and Creeds. All I desire is, that the Bible shall be consistent with itself. The teaching that men are made to work out a kind of atonement on the earth, to bear a punishment which is in some sense a recompense and equivalent for their sin, is not peculiar to this verse, and therefore need cause us no special difficulty here. The reconciliation of this conception with that of the overarching atonement of the Christ and the glad doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is obviously far beyond the range of the present paper. The difficulty we have to face in this particular verse is, not that sin is recompensed, but that it is recompensed *double*. Is this specific difficulty satisfactorily met in the words I have quoted? I do not think so.

The solution given is, that it is the height of grace to conceal grace. The response rises irresistibly to our lips: If that be so, in the case of God at least, then the Divine method of dealing with men is inexplicable, and not at all

calculated to reach the height of grace. For, with the supposed exception of this obscure passage, God, as revealed in the sacred Scriptures, is for ever striving to make the world see how gracious He is. There is clearly some point where the analogy breaks down. Here again, however, we are on the verge of a vast subject upon which we cannot now enter, namely, the relation of the perfection of God's grace to the full proclamation of it. However it may be in the case of a man, it is certain that God's grace is not lessened by His desire to make us know that He is gracious. Therefore the explanation that God is *concealing* His grace is scarcely satisfactory in the light of the fact that the one aim of the historical revelation was to *reveal* His grace. Besides, the minimizing of the evil desert of sin in any way is contrary to the whole tendency of the sacred Scriptures. Grace can be magnified only while the full awfulness of sin is steadily kept in view; so that the remission of sin is always made to magnify Divine grace through the sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. On the other hand, wherever the recompense of sin, and not its remission, is dealt with, solemn care is taken to represent the recompense as not exceeding the desert of the sin; for the slightest suspicion of punishment beyond desert would throw human life straightway into moral confusion. The meaning, then, which is usually given to Isaiah's words, even if it is poetry, is very dangerous poetry, and not the sort of thing we should expect a prophet to play with. It was the prophet's usual vocation, not to hide the grace of God, but to reveal it; not to magnify punishment and minimize sin, but the reverse; not to represent God as punishing sin excessively, but to extol His perfect justice. The difficulty is, in our judgment, one of very great magnitude, and no number of ingenious explanations can remove the discordant voice which it raises when we seek to relate it to the spirit and teaching of the sacred Scriptures as a whole, and particu-

larly to the vocation of the prophet as the proclaimer of the grace of God. We propose, therefore, to raise the question: Is the meaning which has been assigned to the Hebrew word כָּפַל the correct one, or is the difficulty one caused by mistranslation and misinterpretation? The expectation of discovering that the word has been wrongly interpreted is strengthened by the fact that, in the book of Job, where the same word also occurs, it has been found impossible to make any good sense by giving it the meaning which is given to it in Isaiah.

Let us begin with the simple form כָּפַל as found in the 41st chapter of the book of Job, 13th verse. The arrangement of the Hebrew Bible makes it the 5th verse. Amid slight variations of translation, the meaning of the word is not at all in doubt. כָּפַל רִסְנוֹ means, "The doubling of his bridle." The word does not mean the doubling of a thing by adding an equal quantity to it, but by folding one part over the other, like the complementary parts of a bridle. The corresponding verb כָּפַל often occurs in the Old Testament, and always in the sense of doubling one part over another. The primary idea of the word is, therefore, that of two corresponding parts, which together make up a complete whole, each part being the complementary equivalent of the other.

From this elementary form, which simply expresses the act or the condition of doubling, we pass to the dual form, כָּפְלִים, in which the one side of the doubled thing stands out against the other as its correspondent or equivalent. This natural, and one is almost tempted to say obvious, meaning of the word at once removes the great difficulty that has encumbered the passage in Isaiah, and brings the utterance into line with the whole spirit and trend of the Scriptures. The poetry of Scripture, here as elsewhere, no longer seems to forget the demands of spiritual truth, and God's justice and mercy are alike sacredly guarded even in

word. Sin has received such recompense as, and no more than, is still due to it even under a covenant of grace; and mercy, never forgetful, leads Israel even through that recompense into a large and wealthy place. Thus righteousness and mercy are vindicated together. It seems perfectly clear to me that the natural interpretation and translation of the words is: "Her warfare is accomplished, her punishment is accepted, for she hath received of the Lord's hand *the double* (or *a double*) for all her sins. The natural meaning of the word "double" as so used is, as I have pointed out, not punishment *more than double enough to atone for her sins*, but such punishment as is a *sufficient recompense* for those sins, completely satisfying the demands of Divine righteousness. It is an assertion, not of injustice, but of superb justice in the midst of mercy.

The results we have attained not only show the naturalness of our interpretation, but also, I think, exhibit the unwarrantableness of the ordinary one. As the word is so rare, we cannot take a very wide survey, but all the cases we can examine lead us to the same result. To make a word which means "doubling up a thing into two correspondent parts" mean, in this passage, the suffering of twice as much punishment as was merited by the sin, is, to say the least, to read into a primitive word an expansion of meaning which it could only receive by frequent use and a very long period of development, even if the dual form could ever have sufficient elasticity to undergo the change. Objections to the old interpretation, therefore, confront us at every point.

This utterance of Isaiah must be distinguished from that in the 16th chapter of Jeremiah, 18th verse: "And first I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double." The word "double" here is a translation of מִשְׁנֵה, which means a "repetition," and the intention of the utterance is somewhat different from that of the other. Jeremiah

desires to intimate that the recompense for sin will be ample and long and severe, so as to prove a thoroughly effective course of discipline. Isaiah desires to tell the people that God has accepted their punishment as a sufficient counterpart to their sin. The force of the words in Jeremiah might be brought out by translating them thus: "And first I will recompense their iniquity and their sin once and again," that is, repeatedly and abundantly. The same words, with a similar idea, occurs in the 17th chapter of Jeremiah, 18th verse: "Break them with a double breaking," *i.e.*, "Destroy them with double destruction." Here we have מִשְׁנָה again denoting repetition; so that the idea is, that the blow shall be repeated, in order that a complete result shall be attained. Double destruction is equivalent to complete destruction. A precisely similar idea, expressed in a similar way, is found in the phrase, "The second death," in the book of Revelation.

In the 61st chapter of Isaiah, 7th verse, we meet with מִשְׁנָה again, this time on the side of happiness and prosperity, denoting as before completeness, amplitude, abundance. "For your shame ye shall have double, and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion; therefore in their land they shall possess double; everlasting joy shall be unto them." It has been necessary to go through these cases of מִשְׁנָה, lest any should imagine that the serious religious difficulty we found and sought to remove in the beginning of the 40th chapter of Isaiah confronts us also elsewhere. We have now sufficiently examined the relevant passages to show that this is not the case.

The natural Greek equivalent of כַּפָּלִים is διπλοῦς. Their original meaning is precisely the same. The difference between them arises from the fact that διπλοῦς acquired variant meanings through frequent use and long development. This causes the difficulty that its meaning in any given case may at times be somewhat uncertain. We will

first however turn to a case where the meaning is sufficiently defined by the context, namely, the 18th chapter in Revelation, the 6th verse: "Render unto her even as she rendered, and double unto her the double according to her works. In the cup which she mingled, mingle unto her double. How much soever she glorified herself, and waxed wanton, so much give her of torment and mourning." Now, John's "διπλώσατε αὐτῇ διπλᾶ and κερύσατε αὐτῇ διπλοῦν have caused as much perplexity to expositors as Isaiah's כַּפְּלִים. Dr. Milligan writes thus concerning it: "The voice from heaven proclaims in a *double* form, as *sins* and as *iniquities*, the guilt of the doomed city, and invites the ministers of judgment, according to the *lex talionis*, to render unto her *double*. The command may also be founded upon the law of the theocracy, by which thieves and violent aggressors of the poor were required to make a double repayment to those whom they had injured, or it may rest upon the remembrance of such threatenings as those by the prophet Jeremiah: 'I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double.'"

The important thing missing in such suggestions as the foregoing is the necessary critical distinction between the words of different meanings that are all alike translated "double" in our English Bible. The thief under the law of the theocracy was required to pay שְׁנַיִם, which simply and primarily means "twice as much or as many." Jeremiah speaks of recompensing iniquity and sin בְּשֵׁנִיָּה, which means "once and again." But John's διπλᾶ is at least *primarily* equivalent to כַּפְּלִים, which means "either side of a whole that is doubled." That this is the meaning of διπλᾶ in this passage is placed beyond all dispute both by the phraseology and the context. As to the context, it plainly states that the intention is to give Babylon a just equivalent of punishment for her sins. "Render unto her even as she rendered. . . . How much soever she

glorified herself, and waxed wanton, so much give her of torment and mourning." These words are perfectly clear, and the remainder of the passage must be interpreted in harmony with them. The phrase, "Double unto her the double," leads to the same result. For, by the usual interpretation, it should mean four times as much punishment as the sin deserved. If διπλα means twice as much, then to double the double must be four times as much. This could scarcely be defended, even as an ebullition of poetry. But let διπλα have its primary meaning of a whole folded up into two correspondent sides, and the whole passage becomes harmonious and clear. To "double the double" is to set over against sin an equivalence of punishment, as one side of a sheet of paper is doubled over against the other. Sin is only one-half of a whole, the other half being recompense. When recompense overtakes sin, then the "double is doubled," that is, the two sides meet in exact correspondence. This is brought out with equal clearness in the words:—"In the cup which she mingled, mingle unto her double." Babylon has mingled the cup of sin. Into this Heaven pours just recompense, and so mingles the completed "double." So the whole passage is only an expansion of the opening words, "Render unto her even as she rendered."

The words, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour" (1 Tim. v. 17) have also caused no little difficulty to commentators, for they will persist in interpreting διπλῆς τιμῆς as meaning twice as much honour as somebody else receives. It is difficult to see how "twice as much honour" could so specifically imply money payment. Honour may increase indefinitely without any question of money payment at all. It appears to me that here again the difficulty is solved by returning to the primary meaning of διπλα, and particularly to that use which we have seen of it in which payment stands over against, and

appropriately completes, desert. Those accustomed to this use of διπλοῦς would immediately understand that the apostle was enjoining the giving of material recompense to the elders that were worthy. The "double honour" was an honour that lacked not the side of recompense.

The peculiar word διπλότερον in Matthew xxiii. 15th verse is probably to be interpreted by the same key. Its comparative form is an awkward one in any case, and one does not wonder at its extreme rarity. But if it is formed from διπλοῦς in the sense of *twice as much*, then the reason for this comparative form becomes quite a blank. For thus it could only mean, "More twice as much," which is unintelligible. The translation "Twofold more" simply ignores the comparative form, and treats the word as if it were the simple form διπλοῦν. It is not surprising that some expositors have fallen back on the meaning "dolum." Yet the last meaning does not fit well into the context. If we take the word διπλοῦς in the meaning we have already found for it in other passages of the New Testament, the coining of the comparative, though still clumsy, becomes more natural, and the sense it gives falls also naturally into the context. Taking διπλοῦς to mean a correspondent or equivalent folding over of two sides of a whole, one against the other, one can understand the rough coining of a comparative form to denote the inequality, when one of the sides that were expected to correspond proved greater than the other. Thus, a thing is διπλότερον when it is a second half which, to use an Irishism which is really involved in the word, is greater than the first half to which it should correspond. The proselyte is to stand over against the Jew, so forming his διπλοῦν, but he proves διπλότερον. The words therefore probably mean, "More than an equivalent to yourselves." The proselyte improved upon his original.

The translators who gave the world the Septuagint

Version have rightly rendered כְּפָלִים in Isaiah by διπλᾶ, but I cannot be dogmatic as to what they meant by it. Yet, on returning to this fact from our examination of the use of the word in the New Testament, I think we can infer with probability that they had caught the right meaning of the word כְּפָלִים and expressed it in Greek by the appropriate word διπλᾶ. But they seem, like King James's translators, to have been over fond of variety of expression. Διπλᾶ sometimes means, like מִשְׁנֶה, the doubling of a thing or process, and is used to represent this meaning in the Septuagint on more than one occasion. But in such cases it means, not a double equivalence of recompense, but, like מִשְׁנֶה, a repetition of the same thing; as when, for example, Joseph's brethren take double money in their sacks. In this proclamation in the 40th chapter of Isaiah, therefore, the natural and unstrained meaning of διπλᾶ is the same as that of כְּפָלִים, and may well have been intended by the translators to denote simple adequacy of punishment for the sin.

The use of this key in the passage we have marked out in the book of Job leads to some interesting results, but these must be reserved for another paper.

JOHN THOMAS.

ASIDE FROM THE MULTITUDE.

A STUDY IN ST. MARK VII. 33.

IF the parables of Christ are miracles for the wisdom with which they were spoken, His miracles are no less parables for the directness, the force, and the variety of the lessons conveyed in and through them. Looked at from this point of view, the miracles of our Lord appear separated by a quite immeasurable distance from any wonders wrought by human skill or genius. He taught by His actions. Hence it is the part of the devout student to watch Him at work

with an eye as keen and observant as that of the Pharisee of old, but with an eye inwardly lighted up by faith and love. It would seem as if it were St. Mark's enterprise among the evangelists to insist upon the fact that appropriate teaching is to be drawn from everything that our Lord wrought. The vividness and particularity of his narrative is a commonplace of New Testament criticism. If nothing escapes this evangelist, if to him nothing is unimportant in all that the Lord did, if everywhere the action is suited to the word, and the word to the action, then the like keen and quick attention is reasonable in the Christian student, and only so will the second Gospel become truly luminous and profitable.

Yet here this particular miracle wrought upon the deaf-mute may bid us pause. Nowhere are the autoptic touches so plainly discernible, nowhere within the narrative's brief space are so many details found in such picturesque compression. But are each and all significant? that is the immediate question. In answer, the devout inquirer seems bound to maintain that a lesson verily underlies all that is told through the movement of the inspiration of God, whether here or elsewhere. How far each particular lesson is discernible is another issue, and must depend upon the equipment of the inquirer, intellectual, moral, and spiritual. Such lessons lie there, often out of sight, and so out of mind, like the "gems of purest ray serene" of which the poet Gray sings. And the Holy Scriptures are as a mine of knowledge, yielding most to those who dig the deepest. It does not follow that there is no truth because it is not at once recognised, nor any lesson because we cannot for the moment draw it. Some day all will be made plain, and those who have here loved to read, mark, and learn, and inwardly digest the word, will be, perchance, the first to perceive hereafter all the wondrous things therein contained with eyes unbeckoned by the earthly mists of

imperfection, ignorance, and sin. For now we see in a mirror, in a riddle; much is obscure, there is that which confuses and distresses us because it is obscure; now we know in part, hereafter we shall know fully, even as also we have been known fully,¹ for love is the key of knowledge. It has been said that writers like Sophocles or Virgil would be amazed if they could read the commentaries upon their works to-day, as they perceived meanings attached to phrase and passage of which themselves never dreamt. Be it so, yet it is surely more respectful to a work of genius to perceive more than less in it of what is written. But once grant inspiration, or, indeed, any theory of it, and the argument becomes an *à fortiori* one forthwith. There is far greater danger for the student in putting too little than in putting too much significance into the text of holy Scripture, and he may boldly take the typical narrative of this miracle, and search in each and all these mysterious actions, prompted by Christ's love, for lessons for heart and life. It will be sufficient to take but one for present consideration; an incident preliminary to the work of mercy itself. But here it is to be observed that neither time nor place appeared congenial to a miracle from Christ. He would have preferred to pass incognito through the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, but it was out of the question; His fame was too great, He could not lie hid; but as the miracle so recent upon the Syro-Phœnician woman was clearly a yielding to the pressure of her faith, so pressure must again be put upon Him if the deaf-mute was to be cured. Hence the strong appeal² of his friends. To such entreaty the great Physician never could Himself be deaf. He who could open men's ears had His own ever open to their cry. He means to grant their request, He is ready for His own task, but it shall be done after His own way, with wisdom, as in love. Thus, before He would heal him,

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.² παροκαλοῦσιν αὐτόν, v. 32.

He takes the sufferer aside from the multitude privately.¹ The evangelist's expressions are markedly emphatic. There must be some underlying meaning in an action so significant, to which but one parallel is furnished, and that also by St. Mark, in the miracle wrought upon the blind man of Bethsaida.² Why, then, this "taking aside"? Here commentators diverge; the ancients look one way for a meaning, moderns another, and yet in no serious or vital contradiction. Was it for His own sake that Christ acted thus? Certainly, as Bengel remarks, with that fine, practical instinct of interpretation which rarely deserts him, "*Jesus ubique vitavit strepitum.*" Yet this is hardly enough to explain the action. Every interpretation of Christ's deeds which lays more stress upon Himself and His own wishes rather than upon others and their relief and happiness is bound to miss the mark. It is, therefore, all the more important to observe precisely what the Lord was about to do. He was about to restore to this sufferer the sense of hearing and the power of speech. Of these two he had wholly lost the one, and, since there lies a mysterious physical affinity between them, had partly become bereft of the other.³ No wonder if, at a later moment, the Master sighed; no wonder if He sighed, who knew the awful responsibility of the possession of such gifts, and their cruel misuse amongst men. Hence the sigh and the taking aside are correlative and mutually explanatory. There is no necessity for narrowing down the interpretation of the latter sign. Commentators are not wholly upon a false track, if one suggests as its reason the avoidance of all ostentation; another, the desire of retirement for its own sake; another, that the action was symbolic of a complete separation from heathen surroundings; for all these may be

¹ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν.

² St. Mark viii. 23.

³ κωφὸν καὶ μογιῶλον, v. 32.

contributory factors to the sign given. But, as a moral dealing was the ultimate end of all Christ's cures, so it is with all the details of them. This was kept in view by the Saviour not only in the miracle as a whole, but in its several parts. Hence, before He would heal this man He would deal with him alone, as later with the blind man of Bethsaida, and thus He takes the man aside from the multitude privately. He meant to concentrate the man's attention upon His own Divine Person, and so quicken his faith and his love. From the nature of the circumstances it is not known what here passed between the great Healer and the healed. But who can doubt that the golden opportunity of privacy was employed by the Saviour for some special act of illumination, and that the sufferer was told of sin as worse than any physical defect, of Himself as the great Physician of the soul, and that, before the awful interview was closed, he too was bidden to "go and sin no more"? An awful interview—yes, assuredly so. It requires but little effort of imagination to suppose the deaf-mute, with his eyesight all the quicker from the loss or inertness of other powers, shrinking somewhat even from the loving glance and gracious guidance of Jesus as He looked upon him, and led him forth and away from his fellows. If the action seems insignificant to any now, it could hardly have been so to the patient then. The Prophet of Nazareth was surely like other wonder-workers of whom he had heard, and would welcome the presence of spectators. For himself, he had placed himself in the hands of his friends. Why, then, in a crisis of tremulous embarrassment, should he be deprived of their company? for he could not know that they were a hindrance to his cure. Should he take the proffered grasp, or decline it? It may be that the acceptance came as much out of regard to his friends as from a full belief in the Lord, but the germ of faith was accepted, and the sufferer was healed.

This action of the Saviour appears thus to be luminous

the moment it is regarded as a preliminary to a spiritual process. What is here writ so small by the Evangelist is writ large in the sphere of religious experience; it has its counterpart in the stories of countless human lives whose moral diseases have been arrested by the working of Divine grace. The Gospel narrative reveals two main drifts of this gracious process. It is seen in action among multitudes, it is seen in influence upon individuals; but if one looks for lessons of the deepest spiritual import, it is assuredly most easy and plain to discern them in Christ's recorded dealings with this and that person in particular. How clearly these are read when at some crisis He is seen to deal with the Baptist, with Nicodemus, with Mary Magdalene, with Pilate, with the Woman of Samaria, with St. Paul, or in training the several members of the Apostolic College! It is then that what He said or did to each of these as individuals appeals most directly to heart and conscience.

It is so here: The deaf-mute appears on the scene only to disappear. A few graphic touches picture the miracle; but had it only been recorded that the Lord took him aside from the multitude privately, it would at least declare to opening eye and listening ear the chief mode of His dealing with men, whom, with all their imperfections and faults strong upon them, He would enlist into His high service. For as often as He deals with the souls of men in mercy to some spiritual defect or disease, or when He has some special act of love in design, or when He must needs brace them for some greater enterprise, or when He will fill them with a fuller measure of the virtue that passes out from Himself, then He takes them aside, apart from the multitude, privately.

If God always treated men as they wished, this process of His mercy would not be as frequent as it is, for He sometimes seems to take men aside all unwilling. They

do not like this singling out, they prefer the shelter of the multitude,—to be one of a company, a society, a congregation, a church, but not to be alone, not to be taken in hand alone by God Himself.

Here physical disease and ill-health occur as apt illustrations of the Divine method of taking aside. A man lies sick; it may be a sickness unto death. His body is full of pain and distress. But with this, by common experience, his mind is not only unimpaired, but more alert than ever. Sickness has brought with it new conditions, strange, unwelcome surroundings. It is not merely that doing is exchanged for suffering, but exchanged for contemplation. And as his mind works one thought is dominant, and presses for an expression which is rarely permitted to it. The sick man discovers a new sense of loneliness. Friends and attendants may pass in and out of the chamber, but their whisperings convince him that he is no longer quite one of them. They seem to be slipping away from him and he from them. The horror of a great desolation is upon him, he feels like one deserted. He is at last alone, alone yet not alone, for He who has taken the sufferer aside is beside him still.

There have been sick folk tended by a devoted ministry who have felt so intensely this sense of being thus alone, in other words, their own individuality in the presence of their Maker, as scarcely to be able to endure it. Yet these have learnt before God called them into the nearer Presence to take from this very truth and fact a strong and eternal consolation, and man's necessity has thus become the Divine opportunity.

But if sickness and suffering appear from this to be blessings in disguise, they are not the only methods at God's disposal. Those whose faith and love are equal to the venture of a nearer and closer walk with God, will find their reward at any and every turn of life. The monastic

life, with all its historical failures and errors, still stands as a sign through the ages of the true value set upon retirement from the world; the best and most characteristic features of Puritanism indicate the like view, the mind and temper of the fast vanishing body of the Quakers point the same way. In the present day, an age not worse but certainly more restless than the past, Lents or some equivalent for such a season, retreats, quiet days and the like have come to be looked upon no longer as symbols of party, but as serious helps to all who desire to attain to a higher standard of the religious life. Another generation will probably witness the establishment of a further point of re-union in this issue. For the beauty and the blessing of the corporate life of Christians will not only not be forgotten, but vastly enhanced by the discipline of silence and retirement, by the happy, fruitful training of meditation and communion with God alone. For in lonely meditation, in the quiet, calm contemplation of every high and holy theme of our common salvation, in the deliberate abandonment, it may, be of common society, and ordinary conversation, is often found the unexpected blessing of the presence of the Master. His eye is then specially upon us, and it is His hand which is leading us aside. It is no new thought, it is as true now as in the days of Austin.

“Qui intendit ad interiora et spiritualia pervenire
Oportet eum cum Jesu declinare a turba.”

B. WHITEFOORD.

THE SON OF MAN.

IN the wonderful summary of the beginnings of earthly life, found in the first three chapters of the Book of Genesis, we read, "And the man gave names to all cattle, and to the fowls of the air, and to every beast of the field." This is the first recorded deed of the new Adam, or "the man"; and it is somewhat singular that, even before a helpmeet is provided for him, and before he has tilled the soil of his new Eden, he looks over into the outlying world; he recognises forms of animal life differing from his own, and forthwith he adjusts his relations with these earlier creations. He throws out a name, as a sort of lasso, and in that nominal way binds them to himself, as his servants and underlings; but whether those names were given randomly, or by some heavenly illumination, we have no means of ascertaining now. But names, as a rule, are not given randomly; they are significant and suggestive. The name is often the index of a character, the epitome of a life. Cut it open, and you will often find crystallized within it some far-off historic fact; as the name "England" tells of the migration of the Angles, or as the marches of the Danes may be traced in the names of our villages and hamlets. And to a greater extent still is this the case with Scripture names. Facts, characters, and prophecies are embedded in them. Indeed, Heaven sometimes steps in to alter a name already given, as when "Jacob" became "Israel," or as "Simon," renamed by Jesus himself, became "Peter," and James and John became the "Boanerges."

We might therefore expect that when the Messiah did make His appearance, Heaven would lay special emphasis upon His name, and such indeed was the case. True, the name "Jesus" was but the old name of "Joshua," but it had an angelic announcement, and it was now invested

with a far deeper meaning, for it meant that He should save His people—humanity at large—from their sins. “Jesus” was the name of the Emmanuel, God with us. This was the name that absorbed the name of “Mary”—for in familiar speech she was only “the mother of Jesus,” so losing her individuality in the greater glory of her Divine Son, this was the name, the only one, the law recognised, and that was spelt in large letters in the trilingual inscription of the Cross. But gradually the “Christ” was added as a surname, and when we get beyond the Acts of the Apostles we find the two names indissolubly united, the one showing His earthly relation, the other His heavenly; the one indicating His mission, the other His commission.

But the names and titles given to Jesus are many. He is the “Nazarene,” the “son of Joseph,” “Elias,” “the risen Baptist,” “a prophet mighty in deed and word,” “a teacher sent from God,” “the Son of David,” “the Son of God”; until Thomas, standing in the glory of the resurrection days, gives the crowning note of all, than which angels can go no higher, “My Lord and my God.” But it will be noticed that Jesus Himself uses none of these. He never once calls Himself “Christ,” for when He says, “Behoved it not Christ to suffer these things” (Luke xxiv. 26), He was speaking rather of the impersonal Christ, the Christ whose features were portrayed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in the vision of the Prophet and the song of the Psalmist. But Jesus passes by these titles of honour, to select one which, like Himself, was of no reputation, and whose only suggestion was that of humanity and humility. Almost invariably He calls Himself “the Son of Man,” until we count the title nearly eighty times in the pages of the Gospels. But while Jesus uses it so frequently, the disciples never ascribe it to Jesus, at any rate before the resurrection. It was the new and mysterious name their narrow thought could not spell; and even after the Ascension we only find

it given three times to Christ, and then it was as Stephen and John looked through the opened gates of heaven, in the supreme moment of their apocalypse. Then only do we find the word, so sacred to humanity, coming to earth as it were in heavenly echoes. Why then does Jesus use it so repeatedly and so exclusively? Shall we pass the word through the prism of our analysis, and so make it give up the secrets of its hidden light, the silent music of its deep harmonies? We may indeed try, but the sunlight is too vast in its widths and depths for our little prism; and with all our searching we shall only arrest a few fugitive beams.

And first we may notice that the use of the title "Son of Man" is the formulated claim of Jesus to the Messiahship. It was not a new phrase, but one already familiar to the Hebrew mind. Their psalms had spoken of "sons of men," but here it was mainly a reminder of their humanness, as was also the "son of man" who was made a little lower than the angels. In the prophecy by Ezekiel we find the title constantly given by Heaven to the prophet himself, though he never assumed it, or made use of it except as repeating the heavenly designation. In the prophecy by Daniel (vii. 13) we read of "one like unto the Son of man," who should possess all "dominion and glory"; an "everlasting dominion which shall not pass away," and "a kingdom which shall not be destroyed." From this time the title "Son of man" became one of the favourite designations of the coming Messiah; and like another ark of gold, it moved downward through the centuries, carrying within it all their national hopes and longings, and their bright Hebrew dreams. When Jesus then took up this prophetic name, wrapping it about His own person in frequent iteration, shutting out effectually every other possible claimant as He called Himself "*the* Son of man"—for there could be but one—it could be nothing less than His formal claim to the Messiahship. He thus put Himself right in the focal

point of all the histories. He stepped up at once to David's vacant throne, and gathering up the scattered lights of prophecy, He drew them as a rainbow about Himself,—and with no air of presumption either—who in His own person was Balaam's Star, Jacob's Shiloh, and Isaiah's Immanuel. He is the "Son of man" among men, but separated by infinite distances from all other sons of men.

And let us observe further how Jesus laid stress upon Humanity, making Himself familiar with our human nature in all its phases and its changes. Why did He not come like the first Adam, wrapping the red clay of earth about His perfected manhood, and then standing by the gate to call man back to his lost paradise? He might even then have been a man among men, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, human yet Divine. But that was not His mode. He preferred to take His humanity as we do ours; to have a human birth, and to put about Himself the weakness, the helplessness of infancy. That is, the Divine Man consented to have thirty years of growth and waiting, that He might be a child among children, and that He might reach His perfected manhood through the slow processes of infancy and youth. The first Adam had no need of mental discipline and training; he read the secrets of nature as by intuition. The Garden was to him an open volume, and though in its leaves there were meanings deeper than he knew, yet he could read enough for his own purposes and need; and that he could name the animals of the field shows that he could read their differing natures, prophesying their uses, and that with commanding voice he could teach them to obey. But not thus was the coming of the "Son of man." He came as the "infant of days." His body was that most helpless of all lives, a human infancy, whose muscles have not yet learned to vibrate to the pulsations of the will; an infancy that has no power of self-help whatever, but that needs the swaddling clothes to support it from its own

weakness, and that must needs be "mothered" into self-consciousness and strength. Strange as it appears, the child Jesus was but a child among other children. Angels might sing His advent as they hovered about the Bethlehem hills; He did not hear their song, or notice the adoration of the shepherds. The wise men might spread out their gold and frankincense, the child Jesus did not salute them, or even give them a smile of recognition, for it takes an infant at least a month to weave its first smile. The first three years of the Divine Childhood were passed in Egypt, hard by the Nile, and within the shadow of the Pyramids, and yet in all His words we find no Egyptian colouring. In the still, clear depths of His speech-depths which have not been sounded yet, we can trace easily the reflections of His boyhood's life, the pastoral scenes of Galilee, the *clay* cottages, the spring floods, the hillside shepherding; but there is no mention of that higher civilization that Egypt knew. Strange it is, and yet not strange, but a thing most natural and human; for where are our recollections of our three earliest years? They must be somewhere in our past—so many units in the lengthening sum—but we have no lien upon them. Memory cannot even recall them; they are and yet are not. They are but as the shelving shore, covered by the tides of the deep silence out of which our life emerges; but they slope up to the *terra firma*, where identity becomes apparent, and memory asserts her claim to all manorial rights. And so we are not surprised that when the Divine Son is called out of Egypt its scenes should all drop away from the memory like the shell of the chrysalis.

It is true we know little about the Divine Childhood, though tradition, here as elsewhere, is garrulous enough. The only glimpses of the boyhood the Gospels give us are in Luke ii. 40-52, where we read that "He was subject to His parents," that "the grace of God was upon Him," that "He increased in stature and in wisdom"; and where we have

the Temple episode, the Boy, now twelve years old, sitting in the midst of the doctors. The whole Gospel of the Boyhood is thus embraced within the limits of thirteen sentences, and in none of its statements do we find anything of the superhuman. He had, indeed, a special endowment of grace, as is implied in the phrase, "the grace of God was upon Him"; He had rare mental powers, as the incident of the Temple shows; He was possessed of a wisdom and dignity far beyond His years; but with all this, the mental and the physical development were thoroughly human, the body increasing in stature, and the mind in wisdom, imperceptibly, and under the ordinary conditions of physical and mental growth.

Just so is it, if we follow up the Boyhood into Youth and Manhood. The very silence of the eighteen years is instructive, for it leaves no room for anything abnormal, or unhuman, if we may be allowed that prefix. His life grew up configuring itself to its environment with as perfect a naturalness as when the bud expands within its calyx. The home, the school, the shop, the synagogue, were the four sides of the perfect square that measured the life in its earthly limits; in its height it touched the heavens, reaching up among the infinities. He was the perfect Man, a Son of nature, as well as a Child of grace. It is not likely that every one in Nazareth knew Him, for it was a city of, probably, ten or twelve thousand inhabitants; but He evidently was well known. His fellow-townsmen could recognise Him directly as "the son of the carpenter," and with true Eastern neighbourliness could run over the names of mother, brothers, and sisters (Matthew xiii. 55).

And not only did Jesus dignify our humanity by voluntarily assuming it, going with it along its several stages as far as hate and sin allowed Him, but he seemed to delight in emphasizing, or underscoring the word, that He might teach the world to spell it large. Usually our human life is

something detached and separate. It has its blood relations, and its outside world-relations; but in its orbit it keeps in the main to its own plane, with but little intercourse with those of adjacent, higher or lower, planes. In India these social differences are formulated into what is called "caste," and whole groups of humanity are shut out from each other by impassable barriers, and that too under the sanction of religion, or what they call religion. In countries civilized and Christian the same thing appears under a slightly altered name, as "caste" becomes "class." But Jesus knew nothing of these distinctions; He simply ignored them. It mattered nothing what the dress might be; whether it bore the badge of this or that rank, this or that school. He looked only at the human heart that was beating underneath, and which had all the greater need when it was unconscious of that need. And so we find the very poor crowding around Him, sure of some beatitude. Nor was it the "common people" only who heard Him gladly. Roman officials believed in Him with a faith at which He Himself marvelled; rulers of the Jews were among His following, bold to avow His cause even when the Cross had done its worst; while the palace itself had an invitation and an open gate for Him—though He preferred *not* to cross the courtyard of a Herod. Rank was nothing to Him. He Himself might have out-ranked them all, for He was probably the rightful heir to David's throne, and had He cared for the throne it would have been His with but little more than the mere asking for. But to His heart, titles such as king, ruler, priest, were but the small dust of the balance. "Son of man" was more than all; humanity greater and higher than royalty itself.

And how Jesus loved the people! We do not mean by this any separate class, as modern thought seems inclined to interpret the phrase; but we mean human kind in its aggregate, its larger, voluminous groups. It seems strange

to us at first sight that, with His rare native gentleness and His fondness for the solitudes of nature, He should care at all for the excitements of a crowd. And yet in Jesus the seeming paradox was true. He sought His days and nights of quiet retirement, and He loved the seclusions of the mountain or the garden; but this was only one side of His life—what we might call its interstices, its avocation, as opposed to its vocation. He loved the crowds; He Himself made them if they were not there. He sought them in the cities and villages, and in Jerusalem itself; and never was He more the “Son of man,” never more at home, as we should say, than when on the Galilean hill He had the hungry thousands—a myriad probably—all placed in orderly rows. Flower-beds the “ranks” mean, and the flowers that had such a charm and fascination for Him were a massed humanity. No word perhaps occurs more frequently in the Gospels than the word “multitude.” It follows Jesus like a halo round the sun, from the crowded inn of Bethlehem to the crowded Mount of Sacrifice; nor do the waters of the ocean heap themselves in tides towards the moon more regularly and universally than the tides of humanity were rolled up in heaps around Him who was to the world “both moon and sun,” the Son of man.

We spoke just now of blood relations; and with us the tie of kith and kin is a tie necessary and sacred. But Jesus seems to step over the ordinary relations of human life, as if they were barriers too narrow, too exclusive. One little circle claimed His boyhood and His youth; one, “blessed of the Lord” and “highly favoured among women,” as she watched His development and pondered His strange words in her heart, called Him Son. But while we read that He was in subjection to His parents, a child dutiful and loving, yet we never hear Jesus addressing Mary as “mother.” At Cana it was the respectful, though somewhat abrupt and distant, “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” while,

from the Cross, as He commends the weeping Mary into the hands of the weeping John, it was, "Behold thy mother," with a strange substitution of the pronouns. The same self-exclusion from blood relationship we see in Capernaum, in the incident related by St. Matthew (xii. 55). When the message was passed through the close-standing crowd that His mother and His brethren stood outside desiring to speak with Him, He replied with the question, "Who is My mother, and who are My brethren?" Then pausing a moment, as if to set them listening for the strange answer, and stretching out His hand toward the inner circle of apostles, and the outer, over-lapping circle of disciples, He said, "Whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother." It is as if He had outgrown these old-world relations; they were bonds too short, and bounds too narrow for His heart. He could not yield Himself up to any monopoly. To His mind there were relationships more real and more sacred than any affinities of birth and blood. The Fatherhood He recognised was heavenly, not earthly; and brotherhood to Him—who knew the heart of the all-Father as none else could—was the kinship of related *souls*, that in its outward sweep embraced a redeemed humanity, and that swept forwards to the great eternity. Said an African woman once, "We are all alike in the dark." Yes; and we are all alike in the light, in the face of Him who is the Light of the world; and if we would find the true, the eternal blood relationship, it is the "one blood," of which all the nations of the earth were made, and the one Blood by which they were redeemed.

And further, what a significant humanness there is about His words! Others called Him the Son of David, but He never called Himself either David's or Abraham's Son. He did not even call Himself an Israelite, a name that some Anglo-Saxons will move all histories to borrow, as they

play on their little Jew's harp! No; He was more than an Israelite, He was an Adam-son; Son of God, in His heavenly relations, but in His earthly, nothing less—He could not be anything more—than the "Son of man," of humanity itself. If Peter spoke, his speech at once betrayed him, for it was the provincialism of Galilee. But the speech of Jesus was not provincial; there was no shibboleth of local accent about His tone. What an absence of local colouring there is about His words! How thoroughly homely and human are His parables! They speak to all races and to all times alike; spanning our separate lives—no matter what zone we inhabit, or what years we call our own—like a wide-reaching sky,—a sky serene and still in its far depths, and lighted up with stars. It is strange, when we consider His Hebrew environment, the cramping narrowness of Jewish thought, how little of the Hebrew accent we can detect in His speech. Did He speak of the temple, that marbled centre of the Hebrew faith? It was not with exclamations of surprise that such great stones were there; it was not to laud its imposing ritual; it was rather to show that there was One among them, whom they knew not, who was greater than the temple; that it was not the exclusive property of the Jews, but that it was His Father's house, and so the home of all the Father's children; and that the day was near when its songs would become silent, and pinnacle, porch, and altar would disappear in an utter, irrevocable ruin. Did He speak of Moses and the sanctities of the law? It was to give to that law new interpretations and new appendices. He did not tear down Moses' seat, or weaken its authority; but He set Himself above it, condensing the Decalogue of negations into a Duologue of positives, in which was the new word "Love." How He trampled down the race-barriers, those middle walls of partition that Hebrew thought had built so high and strong! working His miracles of mercy for Samaritan lepers, for the

daughters of Syro-Phoenicia, and the sons of Italy, just as readily and just as fully as if all alike were children of Abraham! And how He sought to broaden out their horizon; lowering their mounts of Moriah and Gerizim that they might see over and beyond them; teaching them that the mounts of God were everywhere, and that all places were holy to him who should worship God "in spirit and in truth"! Jesus was no nationalist, but a cosmopolitan. His words were meant for the ages; and so there is the freshness of youth upon them; they never become antique; and they were meant for the great Father's children everywhere, their equal heritage. And when Jesus struck out the personal "my" from His human relationships, it was that He might insert it in the wider relationship, as He calls *us* His own, His friends, His brothers. Or as it is beautifully expressed by our poet-artist, "Christ, as He was a Jew among Jews, and a Galilean among Galileans, was also, in His nearness to any—even the poorest—group of disciples, as one of their nation, their own "*Beau Christ d'Amiens*," as if He had been born of a Picard maiden." ¹

And so we find the different nations early saluting the Christ and tendering their varied ministries. A Roman emperor prepares His cradle, an imperial decree waiting on the unborn Christ; the Eastern *Magi* throw about Him the accents of a foreign speech, with an Eastern accompaniment of frankincense, myrrh, and gold; a "city of Samaria" gives Him His warmest welcome; Italian centurions implore His help, and by the Cross confess His Messiahship; Greeks press into the temple, asking as a boon that they may have just one brief look at Him, who to their mind is greater than the temple, and higher than the highest priest; while at the last, Simon, the Cyrenian, bears the Cross that the Romans fashioned and the Jews demanded. "Unto Him shall the obedience of the peoples be," said Jacob,

¹ Ruskin.

when he prophesied of the "latter days"; and in "the obedience of the peoples," which was given to the Son of man on earth, we find the prophecy and promise of another homage, when a "great multitude, which no man could number," will stand before the throne and before the Lamb, crowning Him, "the Lamb in the midst of the throne," with eternal alleluias.

We have seen how completely Jesus identified Himself with humanity in its physical, mental, and social relations; now we must take one step more, and see how He identified Himself with its moral relations. St Luke in his genealogy carries up the line of descent to the beginnings of human life, speaking of Jesus as the "Son of Adam," so unfolding His universal kinship. St. Paul too speaks of Jesus as "the second Man," the "last Adam" (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47), and in his argument upon the resurrection he places the two "Adams" side by side, in their likeness and in their contrast. Both represent humanity, the one in a natural, the other in a spiritual sense; the one giving us a "fall," the Other a "rising again"; the one bringing in death, the Other eternal life. And so Jesus, the "last Adam," as He comes to repair the ruin of the fall, steps into the place of the first Adam, as Head and Representative of the race. He too is "born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law" (Gal. iv. 4). He moves steadily along the path of obedience, the same path on which the "first Adam" faltered and fell, on to its farthest goal, which was a wilderness and a Cross. But, there gathering its thorns and wearing them as His crown, and dying upon its Cross, He comes up out of the wilderness, leading the redeemed sons and daughters of Adam back into their forfeited Paradise. And how completely He identified Himself even with the sins of humanity! This was His mission, the prophecy of His name, to "save His people from their sins"; and He took them upon Himself,

making them His own, from the very first. He sought the baptism of John, not that He had any sin that needed absolution, but that He might "fulfil all righteousness"; He was tempted, not only "like as we are," but because we are. He was the divinely-elected Champion of humanity, throwing down the gauge of battle in the name of an entire race, meeting the Adversary on his own chosen ground; meeting him who had conquered the first Adam, and overcoming him, and that too with the same sword the first Adam had thrown away—the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." He was "the Lamb of God," bearing in His own Person the "sin of the world"; and when He was in an "agony" in the Garden, with a sweat of blood upon His face, and when from the shadows of the Cross He sent forth the "exceeding bitter cry," "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" it was as our Surety He suffered, as our Ransom He died, taking "the bond" that was against us away, "nailing it to the Cross."

And so it was as Son of man that Jesus lived, and as the Son of man He died. He preferred a Cross, with a redeemed humanity behind it, even to the crown of the highest heaven, with man outside its gate. To Him, heaven, with its innumerable hosts of angels, seemed lonely and strangely silent with no human face to reflect its glories, and no human voice to swell its songs. And so He becomes the Son of man that man may become the son of God. He comes down to earth that man may ascend to heaven. He seeks a Cross that man may wear a crown, becoming both king and priest. He seeks a tomb that man may have a throne, even a share of His own eternal throne. He dies that man may live; here on earth with a truer, nobler life; and there with the life that knows no death, even immortality.

HENRY BURTON.

BUHL'S NEW GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,
AND CERTAIN GEOGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS.

PROF. BUHL, the successor of Delitzsch, has already proved himself an expert in the geography of the Holy Land. He has travelled in Palestine. In his *Studien zur Topographie des nördlichen Ostjordanlandes* he made some valuable identifications and discussed other proposals with much acuteness and information. Those who have used his edition (the twelfth) of Gesenius' Lexicon, know how much superior the geographical articles are to those in any other completed dictionary of the Hebrew language. It has been of great profit to us all to have one, who is otherwise master of the Old Testament, giving himself with such labour to topographical problems. We have therefore looked with great expectations for the complete geography of Palestine which was promised from his pen. This now appears as the tenth part of the useful series, entitled: "Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften," under the name of *Geographie des alten Palästina*.¹ The ground-plan of the series forbids an elaborate treatment of the subject; detailed argument of all the problems, as well as the fascinating discussion of the history in the light of the geography, has to be avoided. Details, if they are to be given, must frequently assume the form of a mere catalogue. With these restrictions, Dr. Buhl has succeeded in producing a work of remarkable fulness and accuracy. It is wonderful how often he has been able to give at least a summary of the more important topographical arguments, although in some

¹ Von Dr. F. Buhl: Freiburg i. B. und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896.

cases, I think, his limits have prevented him from doing full justice to the statement of views to which he is opposed. With its fulness and accuracy the work will long serve as a trustworthy means of reference to the details both of the land itself and of the geographical literature which has been heaped upon it. Nor will the more general sections fail to give the student a just and vivid sense of the disposition of Palestine as a whole, and of her unique place in the middle of the ancient world. One notices very few misprints (on p. 52, line 7, for *setân* read *setâv*). The transliteration of Arabic and Hebrew words is successful. Dr. Buhl is to be congratulated on abandoning the barbarous *dsch* for the soft gimel in favour of *ğ*: it is time we English did the same with *j*. The map is a simpler edition of Fischer & Guthe's well-known work, with several alterations to suit Dr. Buhl's own conclusions. The plan of Jerusalem is a reproduction, also with a few changes, of that which appears in Benzinger's *Archäologie* in the same series. But on both map and plan the cumbrous *dsch* remains; and the former still reproduces the older and incorrect disposition of the valleys of Eastern Moab.

I now proceed to point out the original contributions of the volume, and to discuss some of its more debatable conclusions. I shall take advantage of a few of these to state one or two results which have recently commended themselves to me.

Dr. Buhl commences with a summary "History of Research in Palestine." In this the only emendations one can suggest are—that to the debts we owe the early pilgrim literature has to be added the list of place-names with which it provides us (p. 3); to the mediæval works, given on p. 4, Bongars' *Gesta Dei per Francos*; to those on p. 5 the monumental work of Quaresmius; and to the modern works on p. 8 the invaluable writings of English and German colonists.

In the section on the "Natural Frontiers and Disposition of the Land," Dr. Buhl might have stated in his description of the southern frontier (p. 11) that this is a case where a strict geographical definition does not do justice to the historical facts. The political significance of this region is that there was no strict physical frontier. The second chapter is on the "Surface, Form and Constitution of the Land." On p. 15 there falls to be added to the paragraph on the formation of the coast the influence of the muddy efflux of the Nile under the prevailing S.W. winds. As to p. 24, the Merj el Gharak is more than a swamp in winter: in 1891 we found it a lake even in May. At the end of the third chapter on "The Climate," Dr. Buhl adheres to the very doubtful theory of Blanckenhorn and others that the decay of cultivation in Palestine is due to a continuation within the historical period of the decrease of both moisture and cold, which we know to have begun in previous geological epochs. Benzinger¹ is correct when he says that we have no proof of the climate to-day being different from that which prevailed in Old Testament times. Any decay of woodland which has taken place must be traced to other causes.

The Second Part of the volume deals with the Historical Geography. The first chapter of this is upon the "Names and Frontiers," a full and valuable discussion of, not only the ideal, but the actual limits of Israel's territories. Among other points of interest, Buhl suggests that Haşer 'Enan, "Enclosure of Wells," is Banias, and not the more easterly El haḍr, as Van Kasteren has proposed. *Apropos*, I may notice here that Buhl rejects (p. 238) my proposal to identify the ancient Dan with Banias instead of with Tell-el-Kadi. He calls it "impossible." Yet it still remains true that Tell-el-Kadi is both an unhealthy and an indefensible site; that any tribe who, like Dan, held the north Jordan

¹ *Archäologie*, 32.

valley must have had their citadel at Banias; and that Deuteronomy xxxiii. 22 (which Buhl overlooks) speaks of Dan as *leaping from Bāshan*, a description appropriate not to Tell-el-Kadi, but only to the fortress above Banias. Jerome's statement (*Comm. ad Ez.* xlviii. 18), *Dan ubi hodie Paneas*, is not conclusive, but it bears in the same direction as my proposal.

On p. 73, n. 29, Buhl agrees with Schürer that it was Aristobulus who first really conquered Galilee. But on the other side there are the facts that his predecessor Hyrcanus had his son brought up in Galilee (xiii. *Ant.* xii. 1), and that in the opening of the next reign, that of Alexander Jannäus, Galilee was already so Jewish that Ptolemy Lathyrus had great difficulty in his siege of Asochis, and was unable to take Sepphoris (*ibid.* 4, 5).

The second chapter of the Second Part deals with the "Political Division of the Land." In this Dr. Buhl does not discuss the problems of the exact size and directions of the gradual increase of the territories, *e.g.*, of Judah in the beginning of the history. He does not come to a definite conclusion about the eastern conquests of Manasseh, though he appears to follow Budde. In Roman times he says (p. 82) that Galilee was bounded on the east by the regions east of Judæa and Gennesaret, but this is to omit the fact that the political territory of Galilee included the eastern coasts of the lake.

The third chapter treats of the natural features of the country in their historical designation and significance. In the paragraph (55) on the Old Testament names for the natural features, is it correct to limit the Ashedôth to "Felsenwand"? Did not the term cover all mountain slopes and flanks? Again, was the distinction between 'ain and *be'er* more exact than that to-day between 'ain and *bîr*.

In a long note (on p. 104), Buhl opposes my definition of

The Shephelah, but apparently without a clear understanding of what that is. He quotes it as affirming that the term "Shephelah," at least so far as we have means of knowing, "signified exclusively" the low hills to the west of the Judæan range. But I have nowhere used the term "exclusively"; on the contrary I have admitted that "the name may originally have been used to include the Maritime Plain," and that "this wider use may have been occasionally revived" (*Hist. Geog.* 202 f.), *e.g.*, as in the definition of Eusebius. Still I regard the customary application of the name to have been to the low hills, in distinction alike from the mountain range on the east and the Philistine plain on the west, and have given for this both textual and geographical reasons. The reasons which Buhl now adduces to the contrary do not appear conclusive. For (1) the testimony of Eusebius (if correct) may be dealt with as above. Nor (2) is the wider signification of the name confirmed, as Buhl thinks, by 2 Chronicles xxvi. 10: "Uzziah built towers, and digged wells in the Midbar, *for he had much cattle and in the Shephelah and the Mishor.*" Buhl apparently argues that because the Shephelah stands with the Mishor and was used for cattle, it can only mean a low plain, like Philistia; whereas this kind of land was not used for pasture, like the high Mishor of Moab, but for cultivation. In particular, Philistia itself was not a cattle, but a wheat, country, while the low hills to the east of it are now, and probably always were, used for pasture. (3) In the lists of the different parts of Palestine, given in Deuteronomy i. 7 and Joshua ix. 1, the Shephelah and the Hoph ha-yam both occur. By confining the latter to the coast north of Carmel, Buhl makes it necessary to include the coast south of Carmel and its plain under the Shephelah. But this is to beg the question: Why should the Hoph ha-yam be so limited? Take it in its most natural extension to the whole coast, and the lists become a further

reason for limiting the Shephelah to the low hills. The Shephelah, in Joshua xi. 2, Buhl takes to refer to the coast north of Carmel, where there is no maritime "plain," unless he understands by Shephelah that between Carmel and Acco. There seems more reason, therefore, to understand by the Shephelah of Joshua xi. 2 the low hills between Carmel and the main range of Samaria, which I believe to be that described in Joshua xi. 16, as *the Shephelah of (N.) Israel*. On the other side there are texts, the force of which Buhl ignores. 2 Chronicles xxviii. 18 distinguishes the Shephelah from Philistia, and describes its cities as all among the low hills; Obadiah 19 makes the same distinction. Zechariah vii. 1 recalls a time when the *Jews inhabited the Shephelah*, a statement never true of the Maritime Plain. Or take 1 Maccabees xii. 38 and xiii. 13, one of which defines Hadid as in the Shephelah, the other as over against the plain. Let us take these obvious limitations along with the admitted geographical singularity and isolation of the low hills, and I think we have grounds, apart altogether from the Talmudic evidence, that for all practical purposes the low hills were the Shephelah.

On p. 111 the Targum name for Hermôn, "tûr talgâ," may be compared with the modern "Jebel eth-thelj." On p. 113 there are remarks on the Waters of Merom, including the judicious observation that if these are to be identified with Lake Huleh, the word for *waters* nowhere else signify a lake; and on the name of the town Haşor. On p. 118 the word Harerim of Jeremiah xvii. 6 is referred to the waste and stony tracts now known by the name of "harra," and to the Greeks as the Trachons. On page 119 the district Şuwet is proposed for Argob. On p. 121 Dr. Buhl seeks for the brook Cherith in the W. el Himar, rejecting the W. 'Ajlun (near which in all probability Tishbe stood, and which he identifies with the Bithron of 2 Samuel ii. 29) as too much of a thoroughfare for Elijah's retreat.

On p. 122, to the statement of the Talmud that there were hot springs near Pella, Dr. Buhl may add the fact that such springs still exist a mile or so to the E.N.E. of the ruins of the town, and close by the natural bridge. I bathed in them. The mountains of Abarim had probably a more general significance than is given to them on p. 122. Besides the name compare Jeremiah xxii. 20. That the Priestly Writing limits the name to hills opposite Judah is simply due to the fact that by its date these hills were the only part of East Palestine opposite to territory inhabited by Jews. As to the statement on p. 123 on Kal-lirhoë, Conder is probably right in identifying the Nahali-el of the itinerary of Israel through Moab with the W. Zerka Ma'in, in which the healing springs are found.

The fourth chapter on "Lines of Traffic" seems to me the least satisfactory in the book, and might have advantageously been enlarged. There are missing an emphasis on the road from the Philistine Plain by Michmash to Jericho, so frequented a path in ancient and mediæval times; a clear statement of the Galilean roads, and of the three trunk roads from Beth-shan by the south-east end of the Lake of Galilee and across Hauran to Damascus, by Gadara to Bostra and by Pella to Gerasa.

The fifth chapter treats of "Towns, Villages, Castles, and the like," by provinces and parts of provinces. The following are a few of the hundreds of points touched: For the *water of the pool Asphar*, by which Jonathan and Simon encamped in the wilderness of Tekoa, Buhl reports the usual identification with the ruins and cistern of Ez-za' ferâne, south of Tekoa. This is not deep enough in the wilderness to provide a retreat for Jewish armies, who before invincible invaders were accustomed to withdraw almost to the coast of the Dead Sea, *e.g.*, Herod the Great, and the survivors of the Siege, by Titus, of Jerusalem. I am inclined to find the Pool of Asphar in the modern Bir-Selhub, a consider-

able reservoir six miles W.S.W. of En-gedi, and near the junction of three great roads. The hills around still bear the name of Sufra. On the vexed question of Kiriath-Sepher, Kiriath-Sanna, and Debir, Buhl rightly holds (p. 164) that "decidedly the best" solution is the usual identification with Ed-dahariye. He prefers (pp. 166-7) the identification of Kirjath-Jearim with Kīryat-el-'enab to Henderson's proposal of 'Erma. I am glad to see that he adheres (p. 169) to the Beth-horons as the name which gave Sanballat his designation of Horonite, as against Schlatter's proposal of Horonaim in Moab. In evidence he points to the LXX. of Joshua x. 10, which has the form Ὠρωρεῖν. As was to be expected, Buhl prefers (pp. 181 ff.) Kuráwa for Korea, and the Kurn Sartabeh as the site of Alexandrium.

In the Negeb, Buhl suggests (185) the identification of Sebbe the site of Masada, with the Haşar Gadda of Joshua xv. 27. On the west of Judæa he identifies the Emmaus, which Vespasian gave his veterans, with the modern Koloniyeh, N.W. from Jerusalem, and with the Emmaus of Luke, in which case the Evangelist's description of the position of the town does not agree with that of Josephus. Farther south the name Kh. Surik is pertinently quoted (195) as perhaps echoing the name of the Vale of Sorek. On p. 196, Dr. Buhl wisely declines to fix the seat of Gath.

In Samaria some interesting points are made. One of the most important is the identification (202) of the hitherto impracticable Gilgal of Deuteronomy xi. 30, where it is described as lying over against Ebal and Gerizim, with the ruins of Juléjil (cf. Schlatter, *z. Topog.*, 240 ff., 274). Much less probable is the further conclusion that here we have the Gilgal of 2 Kings ii. 1, and of the books of Amos and Hosea. Tirzah is identified, not with Talluze or Teíasir, but with the Tiratthana of Josephus, and the suggestion made that the latter is now represented by Ettire on the west side of the Mahne plain. As to Aphek,

where the Philistines gathered before advancing to Jezreel and the Battle of Gilboa, Buhl rightly adheres to the opinion that it must have lain in Sharon. He quotes, as has been already done, the tower Apheka, which Josephus mentions as the muster-place of Jews against Romans; and prefers, for reasons of sound, the modern Baka to my suggestion, on purely military grounds, of Kakun. I have the following to add: In the list of towns conquered by Thothmes III., there is a place, Apuku, which may also read Apuki, and which is given as lying between the the group Joppa, Lydda and Ono on the South and on the North Suka, probably the present Shuweikeh and Yhm, at which the roads across to Esdraelon part company, and which may be the present Yemma, on the edge of the Samaritan hills. This would place Aphek somewhere between Shuweikeh and Ono, and that agrees perfectly with the data for the Tower of Aphek given by Josephus in *Wars* ii. 19, 1. The Apku mentioned in a fragment of Esar-haddon as thirty "double leagues" (?) from Raphia (Schrader, *K. A., T.*², 204) is perhaps the same place. No modern place-name can be quoted as echoing the old name; but two may be noted. There is a village, Fejjeh, *i.e.*, Feggeh, about nine miles N.E. of Joppa, which, however, does not lie near enough to the east limit of the plain to suit Lucian's version of 2 Kings xiii. 22. And in the list of mediæval Arab place-names about Cæsarea, quoted by Röhrich, *Z. D. P. V.*, 1896, p. 61, there occur a Şair Fuḳa, and a Faḳin.

In Galilee, Dr. Buhl favours (217f.) the possibility of placing the Aphek of Joshua xii. 18, on the plateau between Tabor and the Lake, and of identifying it with the Aphek of the Syrian wars (1 Kings xx. 26, 30; 2 Kings xii. 17), and he suggests that it lay at the modern Tamre, on the caravan road from Jezreel to the East. In the great strife on the site of Capernaum he takes very decidedly the side

of Tell-hum: as "immer noch die relativ beste Lösung." He founds chiefly on the evidence of Theodosius, that it lay 2 R. miles from the well Heptagegon, which he identifies with the 'Ain et Tabigha, and apart from Theodosius he feels that Capernaum would be best sought for in the ruins described by Schumacher at 'Ain et Tabigha itself. As one who is inclined to support the claims of 'Ain et Tineh to be the site of Capernaum, I feel that Buhl has not done full justice to the case for it, and that in particular he depreciates too much the evidence of Arculf. In any case he is not correct when he says that in Tell-hum, "man sucht jetzt allgemein das N. T. Kapernaum"; for many experts still support the opinion that our Lord's city is to be sought for in 'Ain et Tineh. Dr. Buhl does not fully argue the question of Taricheæ, but he leads good evidence (228) for the southern site. Further on (242)—the gap is a little inconvenient—he comes to the same conclusion on pretty much the same evidence as myself (*Hist. Geog.*, p. 457), that there was but one Bethsaida, that on the plain to the east of the mouth of the Jordan; but he makes this very important addition, that Bethsaida, the native town, ought to be distinguished from the heathen Julias, which our Lord must have avoided as he did Tiberias, and which as a large town, according to Josephus, was incompatible with the *κώμη* that Mark viii. 23, 26 describes Bethsaida to have been. Schumacher, as Dr. Buhl quotes, had already (*Z.D.P.V.* ix. 319) stated as possible that Bethsaida was the present ruin El 'Arag, lying on the Lake and connected with Et-Tell, the probable site of Julias, by the remains of a fine road. The site Kal'at el Hös, further down the same coast, Buhl, probably rightly, follows others in identifying with Hippos rather than with Gamala. Gamala he seeks, with Van Kasteren and Furrer, in Râs el Hâl, by the village of Jamli, across the river Rukkad.

It is in the surrounding region of Eastern Palestine that

Dr. Buhl has already made successful topographical researches on exceedingly uncertain ground. Accordingly the pages which are devoted to it are among the most valuable in this volume. I can hardly go with him in following Schumacher to identify Bêt Erre with the Bathyra or Baithyra, where, according to Josephus (xvii. *Ant.* ii. 1-3), Herod the Great settled some Jews from Babylon to keep in check the bandits of the region. It seems to me that the town must have lain nearer the bandits' refuge in the Leja; and the name may be echoed in that of Busr el Hariri, on the borders of the latter. Busr, Buhl identifies, as others have done, with the Bosor of 1 Maccabees v. 26 (253). Dr. Buhl repels (246) the identification of Kasphon with the modern Hisfin, on the ground that the passage from K. to H is impossible, and prefers with Van Kasteren the combination of Hisfin with IHasfiya of the Talmud. Casphon of 1 Maccabees v. 36 is doubtless the same as the Caspis of 2 Maccabees xii. 13 ff., which is described as a walled fortress near a lake two stadia broad. These data suit El-Muzeirib, which is not identified with any other Bible name, and yet must have been a place of importance. I am inclined therefore to put Casphon at El-Muzeirib, especially as I do not think Buhl's argument (248 f.) conclusive for the identification of the latter with the more southerly of the two Astarôths. The Raphon of 1 Maccabees v. 37, afterwards Raphana, one of the Decapolis, Buhl seeks (249 f.) in Tell esh-Shehab, in the Wadi of the same name.

In Gilead, Dr. Buhl suggests nothing for Ibdar (255), which must have been an important site on the back of the most northerly ridge of Gilead, and on the high road from Bethshan to Bosra. May we not seek here for the site of Lo-debar? (Amos vi. 13 by Grätz's emendation). Compare the Li-debir of Joshua xiii. 15 ff. The natural position on the *back* of a hill suits the name. Dr. Buhl follows Schlatter in distinguishing a second Gadara in Eastern Palestine,

which Josephus (iv. *Wars* vii. 3) calls the capital of Peræa, and in identifying this also with the Gadara twice besieged by Antiochus the Great and conquered by Alexander Jannæus. They find this more southerly Gadara at Es-Salt, undoubtedly a modern site in need of an ancient identification, and with a well, known as Jêdûr or Jâdur (cf. p. 263). But in some of these things there is nothing more than probability. I had already (in article "Camon" for A. & C. Black's forthcoming Dictionary) identified the modern Kumem or Kumeim with the Kamun seized by Antiochus the Great along with Pella and Gefrun, between which it lies (Polyb., v. 10, 12), and with Kamon of Judges x. 5; and Buhl reaches (256) the same conclusion. He agrees (257) with Merrill in identifying 'Edun with Dion of the Decapolis, and does not think sufficient my objection from Ptolemy's definition of Dion's position. But there is surely no process that could bring 'Edun out of Dion. Buhl approves (257) Van Kasteren's identification of Istib and the chapel Mâr Elyas with the ancient Tishbe of Elijah—an identification that will be new to most English readers; while Mahanaim he looks for in Miḥne.

South of the Jabbok, Buhl (262) would find Ramoth Gilead in the ruins El jal'aud, three miles from the river, and would also place here *the city Gilead* of Hosea vi. 8.

The latter identification may be correct; the former, in spite of the evidence which Buhl adduces from Eusebius (that Ramoth lay fifteen R. miles west of Philadelphia), and from the Talmud (that it was opposite Shechem), I cannot judge conclusive. Buhl (n. 882) thinks that the data of Eusebius contradict the theory advanced in my *Hist. Geog.* for a more northerly site (cf., too, Cooke's note in Driver's Deuteronomy). So they do; but the data of Eusebius, especially east of the Jordan, are not always reliable. It is not certain that Ramoth still existed in his day; while the whole Bible history of Ramoth

Gilead, which so often passed from Israel to Aram, and Aram to Israel, points very clearly to a position on the very north of Gilead, and I still prefer some site along the ridge south of the Jarmuk, or further east about Irbid or Remtheh.

In Moab, Buhl advances the hypothesis (269) that the much disputed 'Ar or 'Ar Moab (Num. xxi. 15, 28; Deut. ii. 9, 18, 29; Isa. xvi. 1), which some have identified with "the city in the midst of the valley" (Deut. ii. 26, etc.), and others with the modern Muhâtet el hajj, was "no city, but a Moabite district, perhaps the region south of Aram." In Moab, if we may judge from the map as well as the text, Buhl does not seem to have taken advantage of the new survey and observations recorded by Bliss in his *Narrative of a Journey through Moab* (P. E. F. Q., 1895).

Into the question of the Cities of the Plain Buhl does not enter, but he favours (271) the identification of the Zo'ar of Genesis and Deuteronomy with the Zo'ar of the Moslem period, at the *south end* of the Dead Sea; and he very pertinently points out that the Biblical city could not have lain at the N. E. corner of the sea, because, while expressly mentioned as a Moabite town (Isa. xv. 5; Jer. xlviii., 34), it nowhere appears in the lists of cities belonging to Israel. He seeks for it in the ruins in the Ghor es-Sâfiye. He also notes (274) that, according to Ezekiel xvi. 46, Sodom lay south of Judah, and that this contradicts the theory that the Five Cities were N. E. of the Dead Sea. All this is surely sound.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO HIS OWN DEATH.

II.

IN the previous paper¹ it was argued: (i.) That the special significance attributed to His death owes its rise to Jesus Himself, and is not a mythical or apologetical invention of the retrospective imagination. (ii.) That the moment when He became explicit concerning it was coincident with the moment when His disciples became conscious of His Messiahship,² which warrants the inference that there was a direct connexion between His new teaching and their new consciousness; in other words, not until they had conceived Him as Messiah were they capable of understanding what He had to say as to His death. (iii.) That as it was of Himself as the now confessed Christ that He spoke, His death had to Himself a distinct Messianic import, which was the more emphasized by the "elders, chief priests, and scribes" being represented as the active agents in it. (iv.) That the very terminology employed indicated a sort of symbolism: the Christ, on the one hand, subsumed all the ideas which the supreme hope of Israel stood for, while the ministers of death may be described as the personalized orders and usages, laws and hopes, of actual Judaism. This studious and defining emphasis on the actors can only mean that the death in which He and they are to play so opposite parts takes a special significance from their respective offices and functions.

1. In this earliest reference, then, Jesus expresses what we may term His idea as to His own death in its most rudimentary and general form; but in order to bring out the place it filled in His consciousness we must consider

¹ EXPOSITOR for October.

² Mark viii. 29-31; Matt. xvi. 15-21.

how it affected and was affected by His relations to His disciples.

A. Vague and general as were the terms in which His anticipation of death was stated, it was yet at once unwelcome and unintelligible to His disciples. For from this point onwards a change which profoundly affects their mutual relations may be seen in process. Their agreement with Him as to the central matter—His Messiahship—only accentuates the radical difference between them as to what the Messiah is to be and what He ought to do. The "Christ" Jesus conceives Himself to be is one devoted to suffering and death, but the disciples conceive the Messiah not in terms they had learned of Jesus, but rather under the categories of local tradition and personal interest. The more explicit His Messianic consciousness grows the more He emphasizes His death; but the more strongly they believe in His Messiahship the less will they permit themselves to think of His liability to a death which they can only construe as defeat. And so there emerges the most tragic moment in the ministry, the bewilderment of the disciples and their alienation from the Master. The conflict which had hitherto raged between Jesus and the Pharisees is now transferred to the innermost circle of His friends; but with this characteristic difference: while the old conflict was open, frank, and audible, the new was secret, sullen, inarticulate. The signs of the estrangement are many. Their ambitions grew sordid, and they began to feel as if following Him were sheer loss. When He said, "How hard is it for them who trust in riches to enter the kingdom of God"—no strange truth in His mouth—they were "astonished above measure," and said to Him, "Who then can be saved?"¹ Feeling as if this doctrine threatened them with the lot of the uncompensated, Peter, as ready a spokesman of suspicion as of faith, said, "Behold we have forsaken all and followed

¹ Mark x. 26; Matt. xix. 25.

Thee; what, therefore, shall we have?"¹ The natural result was that jealousy, envy, and mutual distrust wasted their brotherhood, and they disputed by the way as to "who should be the greatest,"² Hence Jesus had to set the little child in their midst that he might teach the grown men how to live in trust and love. Even thus their greed of place and pre-eminence was not silenced, for the ten were moved to indignation by James and John—two of the most privileged disciples—seeking to beguile the Master into a promise to give them seats, the one at His right hand, the other at His left, in His kingdom.³ So far did they fall that they attempted to do His works without His faith,⁴ tried to hinder men doing good in His name,⁵ and even when His face was towards Jerusalem so little had James and John knowledge of His spirit or His mission that they asked authority to command fire from heaven to consume a Samaritan village.⁶ The picture of the alienation is most graphic in Mark: "They were in the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus went before; and they were amazed, and as they followed they were afraid."⁷ He walks alone, unheeded; the words He speaks they do not care to hear, for they are confounded, and walk as in a vain show, feeling as if the voice which had created their hopes had turned into a contradiction of the hopes it had created. This was their mood, and it is doubtful whether they ever escaped from it while He lived. It helps to explain their behaviour during the passion, which was but the natural expression of their imperfect sympathy with the Sufferer.

B. Christ's method of dealing with this mood enables us to read more clearly His idea as to His sufferings and death.

¹ Matt. xix. 27. ² Mark ix. 34; Matt. xviii. 1-2; Luke ix. 46-48.

³ Mark x. 35-41; Matt. xx. 20-24.

⁴ Mark ix. 17-19; Matt. xvii. 19, 20.

⁵ Mark ix. 38-40; Luke ix. 49, 50.

⁶ Luke ix. 51-56.

⁷ x. 32.

He met the protest of Peter by a public reproof, for Mark here has a trait which Matthew overlooked: "When He had turned about and looked on the disciples, He rebuked Peter"¹—an act which the apostle had evidently never forgotten. But much more significant than the reproof is the manner and the circumstances under which He repeats and enforces the teaching as to His death. All the Synoptists agree in placing after this incident the words in which Jesus affirms that those who follow Him must not shrink from the fellowship of the cross.² They must deny themselves, willingly lose life for His sake and the Gospel's, live as those who love the soul and fear no worldly loss. But not satisfied with indirect instruction, He, under conditions which speak of exaltation, returns to the idea which they so hated. He speaks of it as they were descending from the Mount of Transfiguration.³ While men were wondering at the things He did, seeing in them "the mighty power of God," He bade His disciples let His sayings sink down into their ears, "for the Son of Man shall be delivered into the hands of men."⁴ But one Evangelist is careful to add, "they understood not this saying."⁵ His answer to James and John, when they wanted the Samaritan village consumed, was, "The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them";⁶ which means, read in its connexion, to save even by suffering at their hands. Then at the very hour when the alienation was most complete, He would not hide the offence of the cross from their eyes, but once more predicted His death and the part "the chief priests and the scribes" were to take in it,⁷ though even yet, as Luke says, "this saying was hid from them, neither

¹ viii. 33. ² Mark viii. 34-38; Matt. xvi. 24-28; Luke ix. 23-27.

³ Mark ix. 9, 12; Matt. xvii. 9, 12. Luke makes "His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem" the subject on which Moses and Elias are said to have discoursed (ix. 31).

⁴ Luke ix. 43, 44; Mark ix. 30, 31; Matt. xvii. 22, 23.

⁵ Luke ix. 45. ⁶ Luke ix. 56. ⁷ Mark x. 33; Matt. xx. 17-19.

understood they the things which were spoken."¹ So far, however, Jesus has only repeated His thought in its original form, His purpose seeming to be to make it as clear and distinct to the consciousness of the Twelve as it was to His own. He could not attempt to expand or explain it to men who would allow it no entrance into their minds. But their mutual rivalries, which were the fruits of their alienation from Him, created at once the opportunity and the need for further exposition; and He added to His prediction of the fact and manner a word as to the function and end of the Messianic death: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."²

2. This saying marks a very clear advance in the expression of His consciousness, or the definition of His own idea as to His death. It deserves, therefore, the most careful consideration, especially as to what Jesus meant by "giving His life" and what by being "a ransom for many."

A. Baur argued that this saying is so contrary to the thought and habit of Jesus that we must suppose He either never said it or said it in quite another form.³ The exhortation to the disciples is complete without it, and so, said the critic, these words were made for Him, not used by Him. But it is hardly possible to conceive a more gratuitous supposition. The words will stand any test, critical or diacritical, that can be applied to them. The heart of the narrative implies its conclusion, for what do the "cup" He has to drink, the "baptism" He is to be baptized with, signify? Not surely the mere idea of service, but the idea of suffering endured to its tragic end. Here, if anywhere, we have a λόγμον ἀληθινόν, spoken to jealous, unsympathetic, disputatious disciples, while He and they were going up to Jerusalem, and before He had fallen

¹ Luke xviii. 31-34.

² Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28.

³ *Neutest. Theologie* 101.

into the hands of "the elders, chief priests, and scribes." It is something to have this fragment of authentic speech, which has, as it were, seized and preserved His articulate voice in the very act of defining Himself and His mission. It is easy to import into the clause too much of our technical theology, but it is still easier to simplify it into insignificance by attempting to keep all theology out of it. The key to its meaning has been commonly found in *λύτρον*, and in a measure correctly. In each of His explicit references in the Synoptists to the death there is a special *terminus technicus* which may well claim to be a key-word. In the first it is *Χριστός*, in the last *διαθήκη*, here *λύτρον*. Now *λύτρον* is a term easy of interpretation by itself, but here the context in which it stands makes it peculiarly difficult: for while it specifies the persons ransomed—"many"—it neither defines the state out of which, or the state into which, they are redeemed, nor the need for the ransom, nor the person to whom it was paid, nor the precise respect in which it is the issue of His surrendered life. Ritschl,¹ in an elaborate dissertation, argues that *λύτρον* here, as in the LXX., where it translates *כֶּפֶר*, signifies means or instrument of protection (*Schutzmittel*), which may in certain cases become means or price of release (*Lösepreis*). He examines various typical texts in the Old Testament, and comes to the conclusion that those which present the most exact parallel to the words of Jesus are Psalm xlix. 7 and Job xxxiii. 24, and he thence deduces three positions: (i.) that this ransom is conceived as an offering to God and not to the devil; (ii.) that Jesus did instead of the many, what no one either for himself or for any other could do; and (iii.) that Jesus in thus defining His work specifically distinguishes Himself from man, who must die, as one who dies freely, or who by His own voluntary act surrenders His life to God. So he finally defines

¹ *Christ. Lehre von der Rechtfertigung u. Versöhnung*, ii. 69-89.

λύτρον as "an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or covering against death." The positions are interesting, and we see how they are reached, but what we do not see is any connexion between the method of reaching them and the words of Jesus. Wendt¹ is less elaborate and exhaustive. He argues that the term is used to express one idea—deliverance of many, *i.e.*, "all those who will learn of Him," by Christ's voluntary sufferings "from their bondage to suffering and death"; but he has nothing to say as to the person or power to whom the ransom was paid. Beyschlag² considers the ransom not a payment to God, but a purchase for God, and a being freed from the dominion of a power hostile to Him, the bondage neither of death nor even of mere guilt, but of sin.

B. Let us reverse the order these scholars have followed, and instead of coming to the context through the term, come to the term through the context. The sons of Zebedee and their mother had made their request for the two pre-eminent seats in the new kingdom. Jesus in charity attributes their request to their ignorance, and then asks, Were they able to drink His cup and bear His baptism? And they said they were able. The question and the answer are alike significant. The question shows that His spirit was already foretasting the passion. We see that while they wrangled and schemed as to who should be pre-eminent, He was feeling the awful solitude of His sorrow, the suffering that was His alone to know and to bear. The answer illustrates, more than any other utterance recorded in the Gospels, the ignorance which was the root of the alienation in which the disciples then lived. It expressed a tragic temerity, the courage of the childish or the drunken, who use words but do not know what they mean. If John ever recalled this

¹ *Teaching of Jesus*, vol. ii. pp. 227-234.

² *Neutest. Theologie*, i. 153.

moment, and looked at it through the memories of the passion, he must have experienced shame and humiliation of a kind which it is good even for saints to feel. But though it suggests to us the audacity of the child which now overwhelms and now amuses the man, what it must have signified to Jesus was the distance between His mind and theirs, the absence in their consciousness of what were then the most patent facts and potent factors in His own. So He gently calls to Him the disappointed two and the angry ten, though in the ten the very thoughts were active that had moved the two, and proceeded once more to explain His kingdom in its antithesis to man's. They had construed His kingdom through man's instead of through Himself, and so had been seeking parallels where they ought to have found contrasts. And these He indicates rather than develops. (i.) The first and fundamental contrast was in the persons who exercised kingship, and therefore in the kingship they exercised. In man's kingdom lordship is founded upon conquest, authority is based upon might, and so the great are the strong who compel the obedience of the weak; but in Christ's the note of eminence is service, "the chiefest of all is the servant of all." This, however, requires the rarest qualities: for service of all without moral elevation degrades both him who gives and him who takes. Humility without magnanimity is meanness; the humbleness that glories in being down invites the contempt of all honourable men, for it can neither climb up itself, nor lift up the fallen, nor help up the struggling. The service must therefore here be interpreted through the ideal Servant, "the Son of man." "Lordship" of the heroic order is not a difficult thing to attain, for men of marked moral inferiority have attained it: Alexander, who was a youth of ungoverned passions; Cæsar, who was a statesman more astute than scrupulous; Napoleon, who was but colossal obstinacy, loveless and athirst for blood. But the pre-

eminence that comes of being "the servant of all" only Jesus has attained, and it is a pre-eminence which has outlasted all dynasties, because based on qualities that have ministered to all that was best, highest, and most universal in man. (ii.) Correspondent to this contrast in the authorities of the two kingdoms, is the contrast in their ends. The "lord" governs as a ruler, persons to him are nothing, order and law are all in all. The violated law must be vindicated, the man who breaks it must be broken. But the "minister" serves as a saviour; persons to him are everything; law and order are agencies for the creation of happy persons and the common weal. The law which lordship enjoins is in its ultimate analysis force, and is, when violated, vindicated by the greater strength of the forces it commands than of those opposed to it; but the end or law which the ministry obeys is benevolence, or in its ultimate analysis love, and it is vindicated only when it can, by the creation of a happy harmony between the person and his conditions, overcome misery and its causes. The creative energy in this case is moral, not, as in the other, physical; and the created state is beatitude, or personal happiness within a happy state. (iii.) The contrast of authorities and ends implies therefore a correlative contrast of means. The "lord" prevails by his power to inflict suffering, the "minister" by his power to save from it; but the saving is a process of infinite painfulness, while the infliction is easy to him who has the adequate strength. The "lord" has only so to marshal his forces as to work his will, but the "minister" has to seek the person he would save, bear him in his own soul, quicken the dead energies of good within him by the streams of his own life, burn out the evil of the old manhood by the fire of consuming love. The final act, therefore, of the King whose kingdom is a ministry, is the sacrifice of Himself, giving "His life as a ransom for many."

3. From this analysis of the words of Jesus, several positions seem to follow, and these we may illustrate, not only from the Synoptists, but from John. The discourses of the Fourth Gospel are here full of elucidatory material.

A. This Synoptic passage indicates a distinct change in the point of view from which the death is regarded. Before it was represented as inflicted, the Son of man was to be slain or killed, to suffer death at the hands of the "elders and chief priests"; here He lays down His life, spontaneously submits to death. The entrance of this voluntary element modifies the whole conception, changes the death from a martyrdom to a sacrifice. The martyr is not a willing sufferer, he is the victim of superior force. He dies because others so will. He might be able to purchase a pardon by recantation, and his conscience may not allow him to recant; but conscience is not the cause of his death, only a condition for the action of those who inflict it. He does not choose death; death, as it were, chooses him. But sacrifice is possible only where there is perfect freedom—where a man surrenders what he has the right to withhold as well as the power to withhold it. Now Jesus here speaks of His act as a free act; He came, not simply to suffer at the hands of violent men, but to do a certain thing—"give His life." The terms that describe the ministry and the death are co-ordinate, freedom enters in the same measure into both; as He came to minister He came to give His life, the spontaneity in both cases being equal and identical.

The two points of view—the earlier and the later—are not inconsistent, but rather complementary. In John the spontaneity is more emphasized than in the Synoptists. His life no man takes from Him, He lays it down of Himself.¹ But the same Gospel emphasizes more than any of the others the malignant activity of the Jews in compassing

¹ x. 18.

His death.¹ Their action was necessary to its form, but His Spirit determined its essence. The significance it had for history came from the framework into which it was woven, but its value to God and man proceeded from the spontaneity with which it was undertaken and endured. In the freedom, therefore, which He now emphasized, Jesus lifted His death from an event in the history of Israel to an event in the history of Spirit, and at the same time changed it from a martyrdom into a sacrifice, *i.e.* from a fate which He suffered to a work which He achieved.

B. But beside this change from the conception of His person as a passive to that of an active factor in His death stands another: the expression of the principle that governs His action. The sacrifice is not unmotivated; it is in order to service, an act born of benevolence. John here supplies an interpretative verse: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."² And there is a still higher synthesis. What is done in obedience to love is done in obedience to God. And so the same act which appears as love to man appears as duty to His Father, doing His will or obeying His commandments.³ The voluntary act thus turns into the very end of His existence, the cause why He came into the world.⁴ And He is therefore the way, the truth, and the life,⁵ the person whose function it is as the way to lead to the Father, as the truth to show the Father, as the life to generate, enlarge, and perpetuate on earth the Spirit which is the life of God. The death thus ceases to be an incident in the mean and sordid history of a small people. It assumes a universal significance, is taken into the purpose of God, and becomes the means for the realization of the divine ends.

C. The ends to which the death is a means may be variously represented. In the synoptic passage the end is

¹ v. 18; vii. 19, 30; viii. 37-40; x. 31-32; xi. 50.

² xv. 13. ³ x. 18; xiv. 31. ⁴ xviii. 37; xix. 11. ⁵ xiv. 6.

the antithesis to what exists in the ethnic kingdoms, *i.e.* it is a state of ordered freedom, where the highest in honour and in office are the most efficient in service. This is in harmony with the Johannine word, "the truth shall make you free."¹ But the opposite of freedom is bondage, and the one is in nature correspondent to the other. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty"; but "whosoever committeth sin is the bondservant of sin."² The sin which man serves may be incorporated in many forms: the world,³ which is sin generalized; the devil,⁴ which is sin personalized; the wolves that harass and devour the flock,⁵ which is sin symbolized. These are but aspects of one thing: sin is each, and sin is all; the death is the means which effects deliverance from each and all. By it the world is overcome,⁶ the devil is judged,⁷ and the sheep are saved.⁸ Now there is no term that could better express the means that effects these ends than *λύτρον*, *i.e.*, where the end is redemption, emancipation, deliverance from the dark powers which hold man in bondage, the means are most correctly denoted a "ransom." It is evident that Jesus is thinking of the fitness and efficacy of His death as a method of accomplishing a given purpose, and this determines the word He chooses. He does not think of buying off man either from the world or the devil, of paying a debt to God, or making satisfaction to law; He simply thinks of man as enslaved, and by His death rescued from slavery. To require that every element in a figurative word be found again in the reality it denotes, is not exegesis but pedantry—the same sort of pedantry that would find in the parable of the Prodigal Son a complete and exhaustive picture of the relations of God and man.

D. The death is "for many." The "many" is to be taken as = multitude, mass. We cannot think that "the

¹ viii. 32. ² 2 Cor. iii. 17; John viii. 34. ³ xv. 18, 19. ⁴ viii. 44.

⁵ x. 12.

⁶ xvi. 33.

⁷ xvi. 11; xiv. 30.

⁸ x. 14, 15.

Son of man" and the "in many" stand accidental juxtaposition. The one term denotes a person who stands in common and collective relations; the other term denotes those to whom He is related as the "multitude," the "many," not as opposed to the few, but as distinguished from "the One." This One has the distinction of the unique: He stands alone, and does what He alone can do. Of the "many" no one "can by any means redeem his brother nor give to God a ransom for him";¹ but "the One" can do what is impossible to any of the "many." His pre-eminence, therefore, is the secret of His worth; He does what is possible to no other, for He transcends all others, and His personality equals as it were the personality of collective man. Hence He is able to "give Himself a ransom for many."

E. "For many." ἀντὶ πολλῶν="in room of many." His death is not a common death, and Jesus does not here conceive it simply as suffered "for conscience' sake," but as "for many." In it He endures the tragedy of His pre-eminence. Though once He has suffered, His grace concedes to those who follow Him fellowship in His sufferings, yet in the article and moment of Sacrifice He is without a fellow. It is "a cup" which He alone can drink; "a baptism" which none can share. And it is so because He stands where no one can stand beside Him, in a death which is "a ransom for many."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

THE MIDRASHIC ELEMENT IN CHRONICLES.

MIDRASH means "Enquiry, Seeking." The Darshan ("Enquirer") fixes on turns of expression and on details in the work which lies before him, in order to draw out from them (usually for purposes of edification) some side fact or

¹ Ps. xlix. 7.

side teaching which may be gained with more or less certainty or justification.

The Midrashic element in Chronicles may be seen in its simplest form in 1 Chronicles x. 13, 14. The parallel account of the death of Saul (1 Sam. xxxi.) is simple history, giving its circumstances without comment. The Darshan, however, seeks out the reason of the death of the Lord's Anointed in fighting against uncircumcised foes; *he fell because he offered a presumptuous burnt offering* (1 Sam. xiii. 9), *and because he consulted a witch* (1 Sam. xxviii. 8).

Another simple form of Midrash is the *deduction of facts by parallelism or analogy*. Thus from 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38 the principle might be deduced that *when the Lord answers, He answers by fire*. Two instances in which this principle is followed may be cited from Chronicles.

(a) 1 Chronicles xxi. 26: "[the Lord] answered him (*i.e.* David at Ornan's threshing-floor) from heaven *by fire upon the altar* of burnt offering."

2 Samuel xxiv. 25 has simply, "And the Lord was intricated for the land."

(b) 2 Chronicles vii. 1: "Now when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices."

1 Kings viii. contains no parallel statement.

More careful consideration is due to the apparent presence of Haggadah in Chronicles. Every Midrash contains a Haggadic element, consisting of stories introduced for a didactic purpose. Such stories, like parables, need not necessarily be true. In Chronicles several accounts which have no parallel in Kings have been pronounced to be Haggadah. We have to ask, To what extent is this verdict justified?

The first story to be considered is the account of Abijah's victory over Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii. 3-20).¹

¹ "2 Chronicles 15 (misprint for '13') ist späterer Midrash," Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. 212, note.

There are several difficulties in accepting the story as it stands.

(a) There is no parallel in Kings beyond the bare words, "There was war between Abijam (Abijah) and Jeroboam."

(b) Ver. 3 seems to state that the forces present were short by 100,000 only of the whole total of men that drew sword in Israel as numbered by David (2 Sam. xxiv. 9, "Israel 800,000, Judah 500,000").

(c) The speech put into Abijah's mouth describes his father Rehoboam as "young and tender-hearted" at his accession. Rehoboam's age was forty-one (1 Kings xiv. 21).

(d) Ver. 11 seems to refer to Exodus xl. 23-29, a passage which can hardly have been written till long after the days of Abijah, being by some ascribed to "a secondary and posterior stratum of P" (Driver, *Introduction*, last paragraph of the section on Exodus).

(e) The slaughter of 500,000 of the men of Israel should have brought about the downfall of the Northern Kingdom.

(f) The tone of Abijah's speech in Chronicles does not at all suit the man of whom we are told (1 Kings xv. 3) that "he walked in all the sins of his father [Rehoboam]." Those sins certainly included some toleration of idolatry (1 Kings xiv. 22-24).

On the other hand, there is nothing incredible in the story of a victory of some kind being gained by Abijah over Jeroboam.

(a) There was a war between the two kings (1 Kings xv. 7).

(b) If the victory were fictitious, it would probably not have been attributed to Abijah (Abijam), of whom it is said in Kings (uncontradicted by Chronicles) that "his heart was not perfect with the Lord" (1 Kings xv. 3).

(c) The story is circumstantial and consistent; Beth-el and two other cities were the prize of victory.

(d) Abijah's early death—he reigned three years only—is perhaps a sufficient explanation of the fact that no further

fruits of the victory were gathered. Hence the battle might remain unrecorded in Kings.

(e) Abijah's victory answers a question, which demands an answer, viz., In the long warfare which followed the disruption, why were not the Two Tribes overwhelmed by the Ten?

A final judgment on the credibility of the story as a whole must depend on the estimate formed of the general trustworthiness of the chronicler. The tentative result meanwhile to which we are led seems to be that the victory is credible, but the speech of Abijah, and the numbers given of the combatants and of the slain, must be pronounced unhistorical.

Another story which might be Haggadic rather than historical, is Asa's victory (2 Chron. xiv. 9-15).¹ "Zerah the Cushite invaded Judah" with 1,000,000 men¹ and 300 chariots. Asa prayed for victory, pleading his faith in the Lord. The Cushites were routed, and Asa returned to Jerusalem with much spoil.

Against this story might be urged,—

(a) The silence of 1 Kings xv., in which fifteen verses are devoted to Asa's reign;

(b) The number assigned to Zerah's army;

(c) The description of the invader as "Zerah the Cushite." If "Zerah" = Osorkon II., the person meant was a *native Egyptian*.

On the other hand it may be said,—

(a) that in Kings down to the fall of the Northern Kingdom only *such* events relating to the Southern Kingdom are narrated as also concern the Northern Kingdom. The invasion of the South by the Cushites and their repulse at Mareslah in the Shephelah was no concern of the North.

(b) That the reckoning of the Cushite host at 1,000,000 is

¹ "Vielleicht liegt die Erinnerung zu Grunde, dass Asa das Glück hatte, einen gefährlichen Raubzug zurückzuweisen." Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. p. 213.

probably only another way of saying that the host seemed too great to number.

(c) That the identification of Zerah with Osorkon II. is doubtful. The Cushim of 2 Chronicles xiv. 12 and xvi. 8 may very well be the Cushim of 2 Chronicles xxi. 16, *i.e.* inhabitants of Arabia.

A story similar in its outline with the story of the Cushite invasion is found half a dozen chapters later. In 2 Chronicles xx.¹ we are told that a great multitude of Moabites, Ammonites, and men of Mount Seir invaded Judah from the S.E.; that Jehoshaphat went out to the wilderness of Tekoa against them with an army whose vanguard consisted of praising singers (probably Levites); that scared by ambushments (set by the Lord) the invaders feared treachery in their ranks, and turned their arms against each other with such effect that "none escaped."

In this account the military details are so vague and the religious and liturgical so clear and prominent that the whole might easily pass as an Haggadic tale to illustrate the theme, "The Lord is with you while ye be with Him; and if ye seek Him, He will be found of you" (2 Chron. xv. 2). Apart however from this consideration, there is no just reason for doubting the story in its outline. We may ascribe the prayer of Jehoshaphat to the pen of the Chronicler because of the apparent allusions to Isaiah xli. 8 (ver. 7, "Abraham thy friend") and to Deuteronomy ii. 5, 9, 19 (the command not to meddle with Seir, Moab, and Ammon, cf. ver. 10). We may think that a soldier-author would have said more of the ambushments (ver. 22), and less perhaps of the prayer (ver. 6), the praise (ver. 21), and the thanksgiving (ver. 26). Yet the account as a whole is consistent and not improbable.

Three tribes (or parts of tribes) of kindred origin, impelled by hunger perhaps or by the straitness of their country, determine to settle in Western Palestine (ver. 11). Two

¹ Cf. Kittel, *Geschichte*, ii. pp. 241, 242.

roads are open to them, one round the Northern end of the Dead Sea passing by Jericho, the other by the Southern end passing through the wilderness of Tekoa. The former offered perhaps the more hospitable country to traverse, but it was blocked by Jericho, a fortress which was probably in the hands of the kings of Israel (1 Kings xvi. 34; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15¹). If so, the confederates, wishing to attack the Southern kingdom, would pass (as we are told they did pass, ver. 2—read “from beyond the Sea, from *Edom*”) round the Southern end of the Dead Sea. In their advance through the South of Judah, a land of cliffs, ravines, hills and caves, they would doubtless be harassed by the sturdy shepherd population of that region, and in the course of a difficult march dissensions are very likely to have broken out among them. The care taken by Jehoshaphat to invest the advance of his army from Jerusalem with the character of a religious act is quite of a piece with his anxiety (1 Kings xxii. 5, 7) to consult a prophet of the Lord before advancing against Ramoth-Gilead. The greatness of the spoil, which took three days to gather (ver. 25) is consistent with the representation of ver. 11 that the three tribes came to stay. They brought all their property with them. (Cf. G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 272 f.).

The fact that the whole story is absent from Kings forms no objection against its truth. Like Asa's victory over the Cushites, Jehoshaphat's deliverance from the confederates concerned only the south of the Southern kingdom. The business of the author of Kings was primarily with the Northern kingdom.

In this story we see perhaps Midrash at its best. It is gain, not loss, that the victory of faith has in this case been set in a setting in which the secondary causes of the deliverance have all but vanished from sight.

It is difficult to form any satisfactory judgment on another story which may seem to some Haggadic, viz., the account

¹ Not “unto” but “to the side (vicinity) of their brethren.”

of the cause of Uzziah's leprosy. We are reminded of the narrative told by the Priestly Writer of the Hexateuch of the destruction by fire of Korah and the 250 Levites, who though not of the seed of Aaron insisted on offering incense (Num. xvi. 16-18, 35). It would be easy to conjecture that both stories originated only a short time before the introduction of the Priestly Legislation under Ezra. But such a conjecture is as a matter of fact in mid air without direct means of support. Other considerations must be taken into account.

The account in Kings of Azariah (= Uzziah) is (*a*) that he recovered the hold on the Red Sea which had been lost to Judah, (*b*) that his religious conduct reached the level of that of his father Amaziah and of his grandfather Joash, (*c*) that the Lord smote (plagued, יִנָּעַ) him, and he became a leper. Speaking generally, it must be confessed that the more detailed account given by the Chronicler agrees with the outline given in Kings. The Chronicler says (*a*) that Uzziah's military prowess was great, (*b*) that for a time he sought God and prospered, (*c*) that his successes turned his head, and his leprosy was a judgment on his pride.

But the Chronicler is more definite still. The particular manifestation of pride which brought down instantaneous punishment was, we are told, Uzziah's wilful assumption of the priestly function of offering incense upon the altar of incense. This altar was "most holy" (קֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשִׁים); Aaron himself was to burn incense on it every morning and evening, and once a year on the Day of Atonement the blood of the sin offering was to be put upon its horns (Exod. xxx. 1-10).

But this section, dealing with the altar of incense, is attributed to a "secondary and posterior stratum"¹ of P (the work of the Priestly Writer of the Hexateuch). If the late date thus reached for the law of the peculiar sanctity of the altar of incense be accepted, it is difficult to accept

¹ See Driver, *Introduction*, p. 35.

the Chronicler's statement that it was just the violation of the sanctity of the altar of incense which brought down the punishment of leprosy on Uzziah.

On the other hand we may conclude (a) that the Chronicler in regarding the leprosy as a judgment has the support of the expression וַיִּגַּע used in Kings, (b) that the statement that Uzziah's heart was lifted up by success is confirmed to this extent that he is described in Kings as having won at least one great military and political triumph, (c) that therefore there is nothing incredible in the Chronicler's account that Uzziah's leprosy was the punishment of Uzziah's pride. This pride may very likely have manifested itself in some encroachment on the domain customarily assigned to the priests; but, on the other hand, to accept the Chronicler's story as it stands is to charge Uzziah with the breach of a law which we cannot prove to have existed in his day.

One more story remains to be discussed, viz., the story of the Repentance of Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13). The account of this king in Kings is condemnatory without qualification. He did "wickedly above all that the Amorites did, who were before him." The punishment which his sins should bring upon the land, would *make the ears of those that heard it tingle*. Manasseh "filled Jerusalem with innocent blood from one end to the other" (2 Kings xxi. 11, 12, 16). Similarly Jeremiah (ch. xv. 4) directly attributes the dispersion of Judah to the guilt of Manasseh.

The Chronicler begins by drawing an equally dark picture of the reign of Manasseh. He adds that the Lord spoke to the king and that he would not hearken. But a complete change follows the coming of the Assyrian captains. Manasseh is bound and carried to Babylon; there he humbles himself before the Lord, and God hears and brings him back to Jerusalem to his kingdom; restored to his throne, he puts down the idolatry which he had set up in the city, and commands the people to worship the Lord.

Even the soberest of critics have been inclined to regard this sequel told by the Chronicler as a Haggadic tale. No real difficulty is now felt in the statement that under an Assyrian king Manasseh was carried to Babylon (and not to Nineveh). But with regard to his repentance it is said, *e.g.*, by Driver (Appendix to Ed. v. of the Introduction, p. 541) that the accuracy of the Chronicler "can only be maintained at the cost of the justice of the earlier, and nearly contemporary, compiler of Kings." Yet it seems to me possible to accept the verdict passed in Kings on Manasseh's reign without rejecting the assertion of a personal repentance on the part of Manasseh himself. If the repentance came late in the king's life, if fifty years were spent in corrupting the nation, and less than five in trying to stay the corrupting influences, the compiler of Kings was right in omitting Manasseh's belated reformation from a hasty sketch of the downfall of the Jewish state.

On the other hand, the Chronicler of the kings of the house of David was bound to notice any good, however belated, in a descendant of the man whom God had chosen. It should however be noticed that it is *not* stated in Chronicles that Manasseh succeeded in completely putting down idolatry among the people. Ver. 17, which does indeed make a sweeping statement (the high places were now used for the worship of Jehovah only), says much less than this. The two years of Amon and the first eight or twelve of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 3) gave ample time for a recovery of idolatry after a merely superficial reformation such as Manasseh's probably was.

A serious warning against hastily pronouncing narratives in Chronicles to be merely Midrashic and in no practical sense historical, may be drawn from 2 Chronicles xxiii., which contains the story of Jehoiada's revolution. If we ignore for the present the fact that 2 Kings xi. contains a parallel narrative, and if we judge 2 Chronicles xxiii. simply by the criteria which have been applied by critics of great

name to other parts of Chronicles which have no parallel in Samuel or Kings, we shall be driven to the conclusion that it contains a Midrashic story which rests on no pre-exilic tradition.

Applying therefore experimentally these criteria to 2 Chronicles xxiii., we find :

(1) That the story in its general outline falls in with the "Tendenz" of the Chronicler. It is the victory of the Lord's high-priest over a wicked queen whose "sons" (? "adherents," ch. xxiv. 7) had committed sacrilege in the Temple. Such a story in Chronicles arouses suspicion at once.

(2) The details as recorded confirm the first doubts. Such details are :

- (a) The prominent part played by the Levites, who are here co-ordinated with the Priests. (Cp. Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, p. 199).
- (b) The delivery of the *Testimony* to the young king at his coronation. ("Testimony" = Book of the Law.)
- (c) The openness and boldness of the conspirators (ver. 2).
- (d) The priest's anxiety not to kill Athaliah *in the House of the Lord*.
- (e) The establishment of porters (no doubt an anachronism).
- (f) Jehoiada's covenant between himself and the people, the king being mentioned last.

(3) Lastly, with some countenance from Canon Driver (*Introduction*, p. 541; Additional Note to p. 493), we may conclude that in view of the late style of 2 Chronicles xxiii. the hypothesis that it is extracted from a pre-exilic source is an ill-considered one. Among the marks of this late style we may reckon :

- (a) "strengthened himself" (Driver, p. 503, 8). Ver. 1.
- (b) The use of the preposition ל to mark the object, Ver. 1.

- (c) "the chief of the fathers" ראשי האבות (found in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and in one or two *Priestly* passages of the Hexateuch). Ver. 2.
- (d) "House of God" (Driver, p. 503, 5). Ver. 3.
- (e) "porters" (Driver, p. 506, 46). Ver. 4.
- (f) "courses" (Driver, *ib.*). Ver. 8.
- (g) "singers" (Driver, *ib.*). Ver. 13.
- (h) "he set" (Driver, p. 503, 4). Ver. 19.
- (i) "unclean in anything," לכל (Driver, p. 506, 45). *Ibid.*

What is it then which prevents us from rejecting the whole story of Jehoiada's revolution as for all practical purposes a post-exilic fiction? We are saved from such a mistake by our possession in Kings of a parallel form of the narrative. It seems almost like an accident that we have this Judæan story breaking the thread of the history of Israel, but it exists and puts to flight the doubts which would otherwise have passed on from the details of the story to the story itself.

(1) Thus we find that, though the style militates against the hypothesis of extraction from an early source, 2 *Chron.* xxiii. *does as a matter of fact come from 2 Kings xi., a pre-exilic document.*

(2) Secondly, we find that the details which cause difficulty are due :

(a) to false readings. Ver. 11 (cp. W. R. Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 311, *note*), ver. 16 (cp. parallel in 2 Kings xi. 17).

(b) to additions made by the Chronicler in accordance with his Tendenz. Ver. 2, 6, 19.

(3) Lastly, we find that the story *as a whole* is the story given in 2 Kings xi. If 2 Kings xi. were lost, and we proceeded on the principle, "Die Chronik keine Quelle" (Stade), we should miss a very important event in the history of the Southern Kingdom.

We get, in short, a double lesson from a consideration of

2 Chronicles xxiii. (= 2 Kings xi.). We get on the one side a warning against rejecting narratives in Chronicles merely on the ground that they fall in with the Chronicler's Tendenz, and that they exhibit marks characteristic not of an early style, but of the Chronicler's own peculiar style. On the other side we see that the Chronicler did consider himself justified in modifying details of some importance in accordance with his own Tendenz.

We will now briefly reconsider the five [Haggadic?] stories discussed above. With the double warning supplied by a consideration of 2 Chronicles xxiii. before us, we shall be inclined neither to reject any one of the five stories altogether, nor on the other hand to accept any one in all its details. Moreover we are led to draw a distinction between some of the stories and the rest. In three cases (the Repentance of Manasseh, the Leprosy of Uzziah, and the Victory of Abijah) the Chronicler's Tendenz is seen not merely in the details, but also in the substance of the stories. Yet even these three narratives are not thereby necessarily discredited. Events do sometimes happen in accordance with men's theories. The Tower in Siloam, no one doubts, did fall and slay some sinners, and Uzziah's leprosy may have followed some overbearing act connected with the service of the Temple. That the suffering of the body is sometimes the punishment of the sin of the soul is a doctrine stated in the Old Testament (Amos iv. 8, 10; cp. Deut. xxviii. 35), accepted in the New (1 Cor. xi. 30-32), and adopted as true in the Prayer-Book (Exhortation in the Visitation of the Sick). On the other hand the details which are expressed in the Chronicler's own phraseology ought probably to be given up.

Our resolution not to reject the substance of the story of Uzziah's leprosy is confirmed by the fact that if we omit doubtful details and all marks of a late style and phraseology from 2 Chronicles xxvi. 16-20 we still have a consistent story left, in which one word only (underlined below) has been

changed. The following may serve as a rough restoration of the pre-exilic text which probably lay before the Chronicler:

2 CHRON. XXVI.

165. And he went in to the Temple of the Lord to burn incense.
 . . . 17a. And Azariah the priest went in after him and with him
 . . . eighty *men*, sons of valour. 18a. And they stood by Uzziah
 the king and said to him, It is not for thee, Uzziah, to burn incense to
 the Lord, but for the priests. . . . 19. And Uzziah was wroth, and
 in his hand was a censor to burn incense, and as he was wroth with
 the priests. . . . 20. Azariah looked upon him . . . and be-
 hold he was leprous in his forehead . . . for the Lord had smitten
 him.

In the passage as restored above we have a piece of Hebrew which might have been written in the golden age of Hebrew literature.

The story of Manasseh's Captivity and Repentance (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11-13) is briefly told and offers few opportunities for detailed criticism. It must be allowed however that its phraseology is quite as much that of the earlier books as that of the Chronicler himself, so that judging by 2 Chronicles xxiii. it may come from a pre-exilic source.

The story of Abijah's victory (2 Chron. xiii.), on the contrary, is written in the Chronicler's most characteristic style. There is practically nothing in it which directly suggests that a pre-exilic document was used as the source. The weight of evidence is against accepting anything beyond the bare foundation of the story as history. It may have been written by a Darshan, who wished to demonstrate the superiority of Judah over Israel from the earliest times, but owing to 1 Kings xii. 24 (Shemaiah's prohibition of war against Israel) shrank from ascribing invasion of the North (2 Chron. xiii. 4) to Rehoboam, who had received the prohibition.¹

The two remaining stories (the Victory of Asa, and the

¹ Yet cp. pp. 427, 428.

Victory of Jehoshaphat) exhibit the Tendenz of the Chronicler in their details only, unless indeed it be seriously maintained that every martial deed of Judah recorded in Chronicles is recorded through Tendenz. Both stories are deeply marked by the Chronicler's phraseology and style, yet after our study of 2 Chronicles xxiii. we shall be slow to conclude that therefore they cannot come from a source considerably older than the Chronicler himself.

In the case of the victory over the Cushites (2 Chron. xiv. 9 ff.) the statement of the number of the enemy and the insertion of Asa's prayer may be due to the Chronicler, but it should be noticed that if the story be a Tendenz-fiction the writer has not used his opportunity well. There is no proclamation of a fast (as in 2 Chron. xx. 3), no assembly in the Temple (ibid. ver. 5), no promise by a prophet of victory (ibid. ver. 15), no advance of the army with religious ceremonial (ibid. ver. 21). In short, there is nothing to throw doubt on the story except only the numbers ascribed to the Cushites.

Lastly, with regard to Jehoshaphat's victory (2 Chron. xx.) it must be confessed that the religious and ritual details just mentioned, though they fall in with the Tendenz of the Chronicler, are not, *when slightly modified*, improbable in themselves, for they fall in also with what we know of the character of Jehoshaphat. But if the details do not throw doubt on the story, nothing else does, and the most critical course seems to be to accept the story, while allowing that the Chronicler may have given to a certain extent his own colour to the details of it.

On the whole it seems that, though the presence of Haggadah in Chronicles cannot be denied, the amount of it to which we can point with any confidence is small. The Chronicler may have been the first Darshan whose works have been preserved, but Chronicles has too many points of contact with history to be lightly called a Midrash "as one of the Midrashim."

W. E. BARNES.

VICARIOUS HEREDITY :

A READING OF THE CHILD MASSACRE IN BETHLEHEM.

MASSACRES have not been uncommon in the tragedies of our world. Human life has been cheap, and hundreds of hearts and brains have stopped work at the bidding of the caprice or selfishness of the strong, cruel man. Massacres are cyclones, indicated by moral depressions, and the reading of the moral meteorology is a clue to their meanings. They often make epochs; they often mark the return to the normal barometer. This destruction of child life in Bethlehem is a ghastliness leading on to the revolution of that age. It is a lurid frontispiece to the crucifixion murder which follows, which is the centre of the revolution. The massacre is underlaid by several of the same meanings as the murder of Jesus.

The guilt of Herod's crime is on the surface, but the royal barbarity does not exhaust the subject. Out of the crimson glare of blood the problem starts up, What place has God in it? what purpose do these tragedies serve in a moral government? of what larger plan are they the parts? The spirits of the babes, loosed from their spilt blood, and departing in a nerve-shriek from the polluted scenes, leave the problem to us, Why are we so used up? The Creator has a serious responsibility in the order of this world, specially in the management of weak infant life. We are, as we should be, timid and reverent, and we would save God the responsibility of these events; but a bold book long ago piously said, "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?" It is plain, atrocities like this cannot happen every week; the line of limit is somewhere drawn; victims are not always to be had. Herod could have had no power over these babes except it had been given him from above, except some laws had permitted him.

The crucifixion of Christ was a crime committed by an ecclesiastical municipality, thinly veiled under forms of law, and a scheme of religion is in it. Look below the surface of these scenes of blood, and we see occult, obscure, but strong dynamic forces of moral government. The victims are not crushed, they rise again; the evil, in the moment of its seeming victory, is foiled.

The doom of these children is an inheritance which has come upon them from the history of their country and the degeneration of their parents, a state of society diseased for generations. The tragic action of the law of heredity is made visible to us: And it will be my aim to show that this doom is human sacrifice offered in the service of God and man, bad heredity glorified by service, a transformation of bad transmissions.

No event is solitary, it belongs to a succession; the present is linked to inexorable priorities.

These babes have not had time to create causes for their own destruction; they are involved with causes outside of them; their own career is too short and resultless. They die under the law of federation. The federal headship, the covenant of works, the imputation of a primal sin, are phrases after Hebrew modes of thought, which express the corporate liabilities which involve human life. They have done good service as working hypotheses, human conceptions of great facts, just conceptions from the poetic and metaphysical sides. The law of heredity gives the exacter, scientific expression to these conceptions, and shews aspects of the world more after our western and modern modes of thought. Truths which have influenced the education and directed the evolution of humanity may change their form, but the substance remains.

A massacre is the acute stage of a crisis which has its causes in the past of the land. Nero was perhaps the most debased man that ever held imperial power; that he was

tolerated for a month is symptomatic; he represents the times. His infamies and assassinations did not even weaken his hold on the loyalty of Rome, because he was at once the creation and the avenger of society. That period of Rome is suffering not from the crimes of Nero so much as from itself, from not breaking with the past, disinheriting itself and creating a new inheritance. Nero is the vermin which is attracted to dying life, which feeds on decomposition and hastens disintegrations, out of which reconstructions come. Herod, as the master of the Bethlehem shambles, is the creation of the decaying social and religious life. When you hear the wail of the mothers of Bethlehem, and see the wave of pain pass from town to hamlet, along valley and across hills, you may read a century of crimes and shame. A heartless condition of society has arrived, which makes it possible for a man like Herod to rule it with his cruel impulses. Society, country, generations are involved in this wanton waste and defiant sacrilege of life.

Two principles preside over our affairs. The one is, that every man is an individual, divided from every one else, solely responsible, living in an unshared solitude of right and wrong. The other is, that we are children of antecedents, and cannot be separated from the lineage of our sires and the succession of our heirs, from the facts of the past and the shapes of the future. We are parts of a system, identified with our parents behind us and with a progeny before us, interlaced with ancestors whom we do not know, and with an offspring whom we shall never see, implicated with our country in the history that has been and a history that will be. We are islands in an ocean of being, and the islands are configured by the ocean. The sense of detachment and the sense of derivation draw us different ways, make the two sides of a rectangle, and we have to direct ourselves by, even as we are drawn into, the diagonal of the two forces.

In the Hebrew and classical ages the dominant idea was the social and the patrimonial. In the campaign of Joshua for the conquest of Canaan, he put women and children to death. A great military commander is never inhuman, and a war of extermination looks inhuman. But women and children in the perspective of the age were very partially individuals. They are mainly social, ruled by the law of heredity, and must go with the society to which they belong. The apparent cruelty even proceeds from a conception of justice. Achan is convicted of theft and greed, and the sentence upon him is that he and his sons and daughters be burnt. The reason for this species of justice is in the structure of human nature. The children of Achan have inherited the taint of the ruling passion, and the object of justice would be half gained by the death of Achan only. The nation must be purged of that taint in the blood. The Persian conception of society is the same. Ahasuerus, the Persian king, outside Judaism, slays not only Haman, who had planned the massacre of the Jews, but also his ten sons. In our jurisprudence there still lingers the idea of "corruption of blood." Felony and treason, according to our law, disqualify a man from transmitting land to his children on the ground that he had not in him "inheritable blood." It has been recently urged in our courts whether even a pardon can wash the stain, and make a heritable man of a felon. The law denies to such a man what is technically called personal identity. Ancient ideas made this denial equivalent to death, and summed up in death all the disabilities of heredity and penalties of social justice.

This conception was also the property of the Greek race. In the ideal state, pictured by Plato in his *Republic*, the individual has no individuality; his freedom lay in the suppression of it. The youth and the maiden were trained by the State. When they were to marry, what they were to eat, were statutes. The affection between parent and

child is supplanted by the affection between the child and society. In this modern world of ours, we can scarcely conceive the strength of the idea of corporate unity which ruled antiquity. The idea of a rigid bee life, with its queen, neuters, and drones, dominated both Hebraism and Hellenism. Ethics was politics, and politics was ethics, according to Plato. Moses, in constructing the Hebrew nationality, was ruled by principles identical with those of Plato. We can easily give to Hebrew ideas a Greek form, and we understand Hebrew ideas better when we give them a Greek translation, for we see the common humanness which belongs to both. Plato defined the philosopher as the lover of God, the spectator of all time, the man who lives in the ideal good. And this was Moses and the Hebrew prophet. When Moses was giving laws to Israel, his genius perceived the social constitution of corporate liabilities, and he gave the supreme reason of heredity for obedience to law and consent to the Divine convention: "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." The Divine jealousy is a paraphrase for the principle of law in the universe.

This organic unity is a fact which we have almost lost in this dispensation of individualism. Lately we have been recalled to it by the new science of biology, which has installed it into one of the large factors in the progress of life, and has touched us with the time sense and ancient derivations. Moses and Plato had perceived this unity, and the ancient world had adopted ideas of justice and punishment from it. The logic of goodness was enforced by its premises. The private property we have in ourselves was secondary to the public property in the race. This sentiment ruled the ancient world. And just when the ancient world is being reconstructed, and corporate liability and personal responsibility, communism and indi-

vidualism are being wedded into a large complexity, the old governing idea receives the fierce illumination of blood.

A bloodshed like this in Bethlehem reveals the serious import of our family derivation. We are not allowed to elect our parents; we are forced into a chain of causes over which we have no control; our organization is chosen for us in nerve and thought; we have to accept the blood in our veins and the temper in our temperament. There is an ancient fibre in our build; the spray of generations is infused through us. The Iberian was a short, dark race, which occupied Europe ten thousand years before the tall, fair, blue-eyed Celt; and the brunette of the Iberian may still be seen alongside of the blonde of the Celt, such is the persistence of descent. But go only four degrees back into the pedigree of any man, and each one has thirty-two progenitors, who have contributed each his fragment to his being, of good and evil. We are a mosaic of ancestral contributions, and into this mosaic there comes a personality, which arranges the pattern, the *Ego*, a Myself, which is neither father nor grandfather, which is the mystery of a new creation, as if fresh made. To this *Ego*, this Self, is committed the mass of inheritances, good and bad, partially balanced, often delicately hung, to be commanded by will, and to be empowered by the Divine Spirit. To each man is given the personality to match good inheritances against bad, and to work the primal law by which we win in the strife, that we open correspondences with the environment over us, the Holy Spirit of the moral universe, lyrically pictured for us in the primeval hymn, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? or whither flee from Thy presence? for Thou hast possessed my reins: I am fearfully and wonderfully made." There is a grief and glory in our being, and the religious spirit is the mediation; the fertilized life that brings us into union with God reconciles the contradictions. By it we cleanse hereditary evil,

we preserve hereditary good, we originate good hereditations.

Professor Jowett has said, "What we have received from our ancestors is a mere fraction of what we are or become. In the matter of our birth, as in our nature generally, there are previous circumstances which affect us. But upon this platform of necessity, or within this wall of circumstances, we have still the power of creating a life for ourselves by the informing energy of the human will."¹ As a philosopher, he minimises the ancestral inheritance; the scientist maximises it; the truth lies in the medial line. The race of which we have come, the long past which is our pride, and the common liability which is made by ancestor and antiquity, are a reason for righteousness. The transmitted organization, the original personality, the necessity and the free will, enlarge our responsibility; and whatever enlarges responsibility enlarges our being. He is a poor soul, struck with fatuity, who makes the fathers an excuse for evil. It is our aristocracy to get a sense of antiquity in us. It was a degenerate generation who said, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."² The message which every true soul undertakes for God and man is to originate good and rich inheritances. To arrest bad derivations, to be the author of derivations of goodness, is a work entrusted to us, marked by strong accents by the tragedies of history.

The future gets its derivations from us. We are creations of the past; we are creators of the future. We are sponsors for the men and women who are to follow us. Crimes will be laid to our charge after we are gone, because we left the seeds of them behind in the family and in society. The man who likes evil will transmit to his children a liking for evil. To be impure is to be the father

¹ Introduction to "Republic," Jowett's *Plato*, vol. iii., p. 166.

² Ezek. xviii. 2; the whole chapter is an address on heredity

of impure children ; to be drunkards is to be fathers and grandfathers of drunkards ; to indulge the irritable temper is to propagate fiery passions to the third and fourth generation, and in the course of them to produce a murderer ; to be covetous is to transmit a subtle taint of avarice, and in the descents of time the refined gentleman, for the sake of money, will poison a relative, a patient, or a client. A hundred years before this barbarity there were men living selfish lives, who had infected generation after generation with that cruel selfishness, which in the fourth degree had so paralysed the moral perceptions that Herod found the way to this crime made easy, without a protest raised against it. His crime is the sequel to evils accumulated in the age.

An arrangement of numbers is known as the geometrical series. Begin your line with the number two, take four as the ratio or the number to multiply with. The second number in the series becomes eight. By simply multiplying each succeeding figure by four, you come only in the tenth place in the series to the number 500,000. A feeling, a thought, a habit, a taste,—by repetition in days, or multiplication through years, by passage into other minds around, time providing a ratio,—and you will arrive at the feeling or habit intensified and expanded, when it becomes a crime or a tragedy. A bad word, a leer of the eye, a sneer of the voice, a suggested but unspoken profanity, an improper story told, a frivolous book, will destroy faith in goodness and turn the scale of a man's choice and change the order of a man's life. It will enter into the family and be transmitted to a susceptible child, and it will pass into such complex combinations, that no one can extract it out of the life of a parish or the tissues of the generation. The iniquity of the fathers festers into the third and fourth generation :

"And in the fatal sequence of this world
An evil thought may soil thy children's blood."

TENNYSON, *Ancient Sage*.

In a condition of social decay small evils will grow into huge dimensions. If a moral corruption were beginning at this period, and a hundred years after a massacre of infants took place, there are men now living, who have originated evils and infected souls, who will be implicated in that crime, as those who contributed to that lapse of character in which alone such cruelties are possible.

In the history of Israel there is a melancholy repetition of a sentence, in which the historian traces the grave responsibility of an evil to one source. It is said of kings with the idolatrous impulse that they walked in the ways of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. He propagates the taint in the royal line; a good king occasionally loses or remits the taint, and thus a generation is preserved, but the infection breaks out again, and for near two centuries the transmission is unbroken, and ends in the destruction of the national life. When society is dissolved in captivity, the mournful refrain with Jeroboam's name in it is repeated in the dirge of the last ruin. "For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them; until the Lord removed Israel out of His sight."¹

The passion for pardon is one of the strong lyrical emotions of the Hebrew, a devotional feeling which breathes through the psalmists; and I think one reason for this acute passion of forgiveness is the clear perception in the Hebrew age of corporate responsibility and embarrassing inheritances. The penitent's psalm concludes, "Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion," because the transgressor has done so much harm to it; "build Thou the walls of Jerusalem,"

¹ 2 Kings xvii. 22, 23.

because he had been pulling them down. Pardon is God's answer to the perplexed human soul for an almighty administration of his affairs. It is no more. Pardon has no other virtue; it only assures us by our mood towards God that He has taken charge of an intricate business. Plainly in a world so constructed that every human soul acts upon another, that the bad action is a transmissible potency, that the transmission must pass out of our hands and is irreversible, responsibility becomes unmanageable by us, and some other management is imperative. There is no scene in the whole Bible in which Christ looks so much the Saviour, to whom we can entrust any desperate situation, and which touches profound deeps in our being, as when the woman, mortally wounded in her own nature, and who sees society mortally corrupted by her, weeps in His presence, and is assured, "Thy sins are forgiven thee; thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace."¹

The scientific expression of the law of heredity is, that those structures and functions are transmitted which fit a creature for the pressures of existence. It is a beneficent law acting beneficially. When a structure is of no use, it shrinks in transmission into a rudiment; when a function is of no use it is aborted. When the organization of a creature gets out of harmony with its environment, then the abnormal action of structure and function ends the creature, and will end the species to which the creature belonged, and the law of heredity helps on the consummation. Whole species of plants and animals have died out from the beginning: the trilobites, or lobster family of the Silurian age; the winged fish, the pterichthys of the old red sandstone; the sculptured sigillarian vegetation of the coal measures; the huge reptile forms of the chalk, and the cattle and horse life of the tertiary age. The kindness of this law is seen in refusing to prolong the torment of life

¹ Luke vii. 48-50.

by the persistent transmission of useless structures and injurious functions.

Good is the health of man; evil is the disease. Good is always propagated; it is the useful property, beneficial in the struggle appointed to man, responsive to the universal good in God.

Abraham began his career in a dim, remote age. His one distinction was faith, a clear vision of God, the Invisible One, which put him into an active correspondence with the heavens. He so felt this speciality, that he wished to entail its wealth as an heritable estate to his family. A variation which appears in an organism is swamped by the crossing which takes place; it is diffused, and loses its specificity, and disappears. It requires some special circumstance to preserve it. In oceanic islands, where crossing is necessarily limited, a variation soon intensifies, and by correlations will carry a creature into a new species. With a seer's foresight, anticipating, as genius does, the knowledge of the latest century, Abraham restricted the family circle into which Isaac was to marry by a special injunction, and left this restriction as an heirloom, and thus preserved the variation which had appeared in him. The emigration of Abraham was prompted by the perception of the rare character of the moral conceptions he has acquired, and the condition by which alone it could be preserved. This is the meaning of that antique idea of the covenant, which, translated into our western vernacular, means the acceptance of the law and terms by which a new life is preserved, and which can be translated into scientific language, as the method of preserving species. The ceremony of circumcision made vivid the laws of transmission, and helped to purify the sources of transmission. Abraham succeeded by working the law of heredity, and all antiquity was strong in that law. He created a nationality, in which was diffused the special spiritual property, which was specialized in its finer spirits, the most

fruitful nationality our world has seen. Paul saw in the Christian Church the succession to this spiritual property, and he quotes the antique words given to Abraham, and by them puts the new age into line with the Abrahamic propagation: "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."¹ Along the whole range and sweep of the human federation good is to be victorious, and the seers of the ancient world saw the victory in the law of heredity, and accepted the promise which lay entangled in it, and taught the hope of it to depressed spirits: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,"—was the primeval hope.

Julius Cæsar landed with a Roman army in Britain about the year 55 B.C. He fought a battle with a British chief Cassivellanus, who ruled in the valley of the Thames. In his narrative of the battle he tells us, in a book familiar to us from our schoolboy days, that he admired the steadiness of the barbarian infantry. "*Peditum stabilitatem in proeliis præstant*,"² are his words. Later, Tacitus, speaking of the Britons says, "Their strength is in infantry."³ Writing of the Teutons, who form the stronger layer in British character, he says, "On the whole, we would say that their chief strength is in their infantry."⁴ 1,870 years after the battle with Cassivellanus Waterloo was fought, and Napoleon said that it was the steadiness of the British infantry that won Waterloo. The same moral and military quality appears after twenty centuries. In the fifth century, Sidonius Apollinaris, a Roman proconsul in Britain, gives advice to a Roman naval officer, who was sent to watch Saxon pirates in the English Channel. These so-called pirates, even our Norse ancestors, the Vikings, the baysmen who

¹ Gal. iii. 8.

² *Cæsar's Commentaries*, book iv. 33.

³ *Agricola*, 12.

⁴ *Germania* 6.

occupied the bays or wicks of the coastland, are thus described by him in his directions to his subordinate :

“To these men a shipwreck is a school of seamanship, rather than a matter of dread. They know the dangers of the deep, like men who are every day in contact with them. For since a storm turns those whom they wish to attack off their guard, while it hinders their own coming onset from being seen from afar, they gladly risk themselves in the midst of wrecks and sea-beaten rocks in the hope of making profit out of the very tempest.”¹

This seamanship, transmitted through centuries, is the secret of England's shipbuilding yards, carrying trade, and naval supremacy. Drake, Cook, Nelson, and the brave commander of the passenger ship *London*, which went down in the Bay of Biscay not many years ago, are the product of this beneficial and perpetuating energy.

Physical disease is not heritable as disease, but as entangled with life. The transmitted disease may be worked out into death in the individual of the first generation, when probably, in the process of the physical washing out, the soul is ennobled by bearing the pain; or the law of heredity in another generation will rally the forces of life to overcome bodily disease. Moral evil is transmitted, not as evil, but as implicated with good in a moral being. Heredity indirectly, as it were, is forced to propagate moral evil, for the sake of the good. When moral evil has infected masses of men, and has been transmitted through two or three generations, heredity in mercy brings it to a crisis and catastrophe, in which it is worn out. When Christ said, “Ye are the children of them who kill the prophets,” we read His awful emphasis on the law of descending evil. When He added, “Fill ye up the measure of your fathers,” we do not read the rhetoric of sarcasm. It is the imperative of the truth that they will do with a momentum what their

¹ Green's *Making of England*, p. 17.

fathers before them have done, and that the exaggerations will exhaust the evil. History all through the centuries shows us exhausting epochs, when heredity restores the disturbed equilibrium. It puts a stern limit to the perpetuation of decay. It also dilutes a collecting evil, swamping accumulations by the cross of two sexes, calling up reserves of good hidden in three or more progenitors.

We thus reach the sublime transfiguration of bad transmissions, by which heredity avenges itself for its enforced relations to moral evil. The law of sacrifice takes its hand, and leads it on to the high altars of service. Bad transmissions are transfigured into service. Passive sufferers are made active in work, and pain is transmuted into energy. The dire pressure of the law of evil inheritance upon children and the innocent shows us that suffering is a work we have to do, of large issues. Laws are servants to a plan, and belong to a system; and we see heredity working into a large scheme.

The seers of antiquity had perceived this structure of our world. Jeremiah wished to escape from the shame and sorrow of his country, but he is forced into its service in sheer pity. To his weeping sympathy is revealed the constitution of pain. In a Babylonish invasion of the land, some children of Bethlehem were torn from their parents and taken into slavery, and others killed, by the conquerors. The wail of childhood became a family grief, and touched profoundly the motherhood of the land. Jeremiah hurries to give comfort, and he pictures Rachel rising from her tomb outside the town, and weeping with the mothers; and the prophet reads a message to the ideal mother. He says that this suffering is a work given to the children to do, and a work of fruitful issue: "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land

of the enemy.”¹ It will work that specialized renovation in Israel, when men will take the laws of God as their own laws, and find them written all over in their own affections and faculties.² Matthew, with the insight he shows in his history, sees in the Herodian massacre a likeness to the Babylonian captivity: that was rudimentary, this perfect in the Divine idea. The fulfilment of the one by the other is the Hebrew way of saying that the same Divine idea underlies the two events, that they have served the same purpose in the Divine government.

Three ideas rule the literature of the Greek tragedies, in which the profounder elements of human nature are perceived and made vivid for the education of the people. These are, first, the sorrows of guiltless fate, of innocent suffering, for reasons which lie in the solidarity of the race; next, the sorrows of the inevitable penalty which waits on moral evil, punitive sequels which overtake the breakers of law from anger of the gods; and third, the sorrow of the human sacrifice of the best, which the higher interests of the moral world demand. In the legend of *Œdipus*, of the fated house of Labdakos, Sophocles has painted the mystery of causeless suffering, which inheres in social transmissions. The innocent *Œdipus*, bewildered with disaster, can only give the hereditary principle as a last sad account of the fatalities which have overwhelmed him:

“For thus it pleased the gods, incensed perhaps
Against my father’s house for guilt of old.
For as regards my life, thou couldst not find
One spot of guilt, in recompense for which
I sinned those sins against myself and mine.”³

In the legend of the beautiful *Antigone*, the brave daughter of the hapless *Œdipus*, Sophocles paints the tragic conception that human sacrifices have to be offered in the

¹ Jer. xxxi. 16.

² Jer. xxxi. 33.

³ Plumptre’s *Sophocles*, p. 96; *Œdipus*, 965.

interests of the finer affections and higher duties. She is doomed to death by the ruler of Thebes because she has placed in a decent grave the remains of a brother obnoxious to the ruler, and she is engaged to be married to the son of this very ruler :

“What law of heaven have I transgressed against?
What use for me, ill-starred one, still to look
To any god for succour, or to call
On any friend for aid? For holiest deed
I bear this charge of rank unholiness.”¹

In the children of Bethlehem taken captive to Babylon Jeremiah perceives a service which innocent suffering gives to a nation ; and Matthew, in the Herodian slaughter on the same scene, perceives a fulfilment of the same Divine ideas. Herod incorporates the infections lodged in the age ; he chiefs them. The forces of social evil, perpetuated by the law of heredity, entangled in the moral life that still remains, culminate in an atrocity. And here the law forced into a foreign service is graciously met by the law of sacrifice, and transformed into a service, and the sufferers glorified. Transmitted suffering, having its causes in the law of consanguinity, and not in the individual, is transfigured into sacrifice, and is a healing of the evil.

Vicarious heredity emerges into a clear truth from this aspect of our subject. Vicariousness is a service or obligation due by one man and paid by another. It contains the idea of altruism. It is also suffering falling on innocence which should have fallen on the guilty. It contains the idea of sacrifice. The principle is seen in wide application in the moral government of the world. This massacre of children is a notable illustration. From them a service is extracted which should have been performed by others. To them a suffering is allotted which should have been allocated

¹ Plumptre's *Sophocles*, p. 161 ; *Antigone*, 921.

to others. We are material to be used up in the service of the universe, and vicarious service is the highest. Boy choristers are essential to the finest music; in the freshness of childhood the voice carries murmurs of the far off and the farthest. The scream of these murdered children, sinking by alto and tenor notes into the minor moan of death, will be an eerie echo heard in the families of the land. Their blood is a sacrament of family purification. When decay enters into the heart of a nation, the family first suffers, the gangrene gets there; and these babes give their blood as a sacramental service of surgery.

There is another service of strange import in this vicariousness. It saves the Saviour. They are killed in the room of Christ. His presence, royal birth, the rumour of His name, the theophany in Him, are the occasion of this sacrifice. They are the earliest martyrs, unconscious martyrs of the new age. Their blood is substituted for His blood, and there dawns upon us an incisive form of vicarious sacrifice. It is human sacrifice of purest blood, offered in the service of God and man by God Himself as the officiating priest. The cradle of Jesus floats in blood of human babes, and is saved by it. It is an index hand pointing to that august blood which shall be shed on Calvary.

Vicarious heredity is a large factor in the death of Christ and a decisive aspect of the atonement. Christ is the Heir: made of a woman, made under the law, the law natural, moral, spiritual. The heirship is not modified in the speciality of His birth, for parthenogenesis is a natural law. Christ is Heir to the good and Heir to the evil in the organic sympathy of the human federation. And He is the Flower of human goodness. Goodness is always vicarious in its operations. It is essentially altruistic. He is the good Vicar of humanity, who does duty for them who cannot do their duty; who suffers for them

who cannot suffer for themselves. By the law of heredity He is involved in the evil; by the law of sacrifice He puts away the evil. By sacrificial heredity He is the author of a new generation. He originates a good transmission, which is the Christian succession, which has continued unbroken for twenty centuries. Heredity makes Christ confederate with us in liabilities, and He is confederate for us in salvation. Christ feels Himself in the succession which began with Abel. He calls upon that generation to complete the hereditary action, with the audacious imperative, "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers, that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel." His blood is in this succession. In His death, as the death of the hereditary Son of Man, the Lord our righteousness, will be the exhaustion of the past bad inheritances, and the origination of the Christian speciality, closing the chapters of the past, opening the chapters of a future.

The master idea of service emerges from the entanglements of heredity. We are under a law of conscription. These babes—what can they be doing, in their unconsciousness, but giving to God an involuntary service, forced into it and glorified by it? Happiness is a by-product and constructive. If ever any creatures had a claim on happiness, it was these innocent children; and they are denied it, with some emphasis on the denial. Their smiles are changed into shudders, and the eternal freshness in them into the staleness of death. Have a care for facts, and we find that we are in business other than our own; and when we discern this altruism and ulteriorism, we begin to see our own business and its significances. Often when we have lost happiness we take up the business which is before and better than happiness, and which has brought us here. When you are travelling on business, you will meet with bluebells on the roadside, the yellow

sunshine of an August afternoon will turn the purple of the hillside heather into a charming violet; but you do not stop over this beauty. You pass on to business. Happiness is an incident of the wayside; service is dominant.

We have more to do than to serve. We have also to suffer, and suffering is severe work. Sacrifice is a severer form of service. In every family circle there is a chronic sufferer from ancestral causes. There are sufferers from consumption, who have come into the world wholly on the embassy of pain. We have seen the dear consumptive in our own family; the most beautiful face in it, exquisitely carved features, tinted with hues of an engaging sadness; blue eyes, bright with thought, as if looking far away into sapphire skies; hair, golden with an autumn yellowness: and you have seen the promise of mind and blossom of matter fading away, the mind light up with its last affections, and the lingering sunset flash out in an afterglow of word and sentence, never to be forgotten, and a halo collect round death itself, which has never left it since, and the family sanctified by this sacrifice offered by the law of heredity. There are 80,000 persons in our asylums, and insanity is commonly an inheritance. There are 50,000 blind and deaf and dumb, who are here to show us the principle of sacrifice in heredity. American slavery was a hereditary social sore, a gigantic evil. Half a million of soldiers perished in the war which rooted it out of the soil of the country. The way of God here manifested is the law of heredity and sacrifice, the service of God and man, into which disabilities and blood are summoned.

If you will look at the leaf of the bramble in autumn, you will find an ugly black spot on the underside. It is a fungus preying on the decline of life.¹ On the upper side this dingy colour becomes a crimson or a bright claret shade,

¹ This fungus is known to cryptogamists as *phragmidium erolaceum*.

and makes the leaf gay and conspicuous. In midsummer, upon a spot where the whortleberry is growing, you will find a plant here and there with leaves of vermilion, quite charming.¹ On the underside of the leaf a fungus is in possession, which has retained the red rays. Cowper was subject to fits of insanity. One authority states that while passing into an eclipse of his faculties, another while emerging from it, he wrote that hymn which will never fall out of the hymnology of the Church, "God moves in a mysterious way." The fungus of insanity brightens the faculties, and gives colour to thought. Lyte was starting for the continent to spend the winter, when gone in consumption. He wished to follow the swallows. In great weakness he bade farewell to his flock, with great difficulty he reached the vicarage, then shut himself up in his room, and in the evening shewed some friends, "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide." The fungus of consumption gives a lyric blaze to the poesy in him.

This is the service which is pressed from bad inheritances and organic entanglements; in this way the abnormal action of heredity is glorified. This is one reading of our world's sorrows.

The system of death is intricate, but with the punctuation of this massacre we can get a construction of much meaning. Death is a Divine service, human sacrifice offered in the service of God and man. Death is a part of the same system as life. The quality of this last service is determined by the quality of the service in life. If we have chosen God as our Master, if we have been voluntary servants, death will become more or less of a liberty to us. It will always be a gloom and a pressure, because of the greatness of the business. Consecrated spirits can endure the burden when they have learnt to regard it as

¹ The whortleberry is known in Scotland as blaeberry, and the fungus is the *exobasidium vaccinii*.

a work given them to do, and a work in which there is a reward, as the Hebrew seer instructed the mothers of Jerusalem.

When the taper of the body burns on into old age, and the flickering light of gradual decay goes out, death looks like a natural process of extinction. But when child life, in its freshness and bloom, is quenched in blood, we are startled into new meanings of death. The vision of the prophets is kindled by it. It is a service; it is a sacrifice; it is a work; it shall be rewarded. We die to take the high idea of us which is with God, and we have glimpses of this idea when service is our answer to the awfulness of death. Death is the sacrament which initiates us into more service and other sacrifice. And as we move into the sapphire infinities starred with glowing worlds, as we once moved on the meadow starred with white daisies, and the moor with yellow asphodels, we shall be instructed into that work which is joy for evermore. Death is a theme which lends itself to paradox. Plato quotes a paradox from a lost book of Euripides, "Who knows if life be not death, and death life?"¹ And our Lord has said, "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."² So life is embraced in death, and death in life. And it will be so seen when we have inspired ourselves with the idea of service and sacrifice.

The law of reproduction for all living is, that growth stops when the flowering activity begins. The branch is arrested in its growth, that the flower may bloom on it. Growth is increase of life, and life is arrested when reproduction begins. Many plants die after they flower and seed. Many animals die when the next generation is born. Death is for multiplication. "From first to last, reproduction is

¹ "*Gorgias*": Jowett's *Plato*, vol. ii., p. 368.

² John xii. 25.

linked to death.”¹ “The flowering of phanerogams is often at once the climax of the life and the glory of death.”² Death is a transformation of energy. This is the vision which Nature gives us. The growth of the children in Bethlehem is arrested, that they may be morally reproductive by death. They have bloomed as things of beauty and joy. They die, and become a sanctifying memory and vision; they become the parents of moral forces. They seed the land with sadness and wisdom. Therefore, cheap as massacres make human life, “precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.”³ “Except a corn of wheat shall fall to the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit,” is the large physiological law, which rises up from Nature to man, and from man to the Son of Man. Reproduction contains the rudimentary idea of sacrifice and of joy in sacrifice, the sweet-smelling savour of the flower of reproduction.

W. W. PEYTON.

THE HOMELAND OF JESUS.

IT is impossible to point out with certainty any spot on which our blessed LORD stood; and it is well, the tendency to degrade sacred places with mean superstitions being so human. We can, however, mark in broad outline the boundaries of His earthly wanderings, and fill in with ample details the hamlets and hills and glens among which He lived His lowly life.

“Come see the place where the LORD lay” are the words by which the angel restored the faith of the women who hovered in fear and sorrow by the rocky grave of their dead Friend. And they saw the empty tomb and the grave

¹ *Evolution of Sex.* By Professor Patrick Geddes and I. Arthur Thomson, p. 238.

² *Ibid.*, p. 234.

³ Ps. cxvi. 15.

clothes laid aside, and we know that He had sounded the loneliest depths of death and won immortal life for all believers.

The Prince of life died for His people, but He also lived for His people. On the border land and beyond the veil, He completed the work for which He had taken upon Himself the form of a servant, and, "It is finished." We linger affectionately by the Cross and tomb as we meditate on the depths and mysteries of the crowning act of His passion for us; but we would also devoutly follow the Man Christ Jesus in His intensely human life, in the patience and power of His unstinted love, and in the exhaustless grace of His pity as He unswervingly carried the burden of our life amid the pressure of home needs and duties, and in all the vigilant forms of kindness that marked His intercourse with His fellow men.

"A city set on a hill cannot be hid," was an assertion palpably true to the multitude who listened to the Sermon on the Mount, and who probably, following the eye or gesture of the Speaker, looked up at the remarkable town Safed, perched on its lofty cone 2,773 feet high. "Safat" is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud and by the Arabian geographers as an important place. It was held in high esteem by the Jews, and became a Rabbinical centre and school of learning at an early date. There is no actual proof, but every probability, that the town of Safed existed in the time of Christ. It suffered from Crusader and Saracen, destroying Turk and desolating earthquake, and still survives, and there is no reason to doubt that it flourished like other Galilean towns under Roman rule.

I invite my readers to take their stand with me on the hill of Safed, the most elevated town in Galilee, and as such a city cannot be hid from those who dwell on the plain, so we shall find the whole landscape disclosed as we look down from the summit.

We approach from the north by dusty roads that wind among the curved hills of Galilee, and clamber up to the castle which crowns the hill to which the hamlet clings. The castle itself has special interest for western travellers. It was built around the oval summit by the Crusaders, stormed by the gallant Saladin, demolished by the Sultans of Damascus, restored by the Templars, held by the French, and overwhelmed by an earthquake which yawned in numerous chasms and swallowed up most of the inhabitants of the place in 1837.

We may picture to our minds the fearful struggles witnessed around the base of the hill on which we stand, and especially that awful scene when Bibars received the surrender of the place, and then, in good Turkish style, massacred the entire multitude who had entrusted their lives to him.

But we have come to look at the Homeland of Jesus, and we must not dally with those who thought to extend His glory by carnal weapons. The most interesting spot on earth lies before us like an open book, and we can take in every feature of it at a single glance.

Among these brown hills and purple glades our blessed LORD lived the full-orbed human life that we could not live. His feet trod those dusty paths that wind among the hills from village to village, and His eye rested daily on the outlines of the little district that spreads beneath us. Jerusalem is associated with the contradictions and contentions by which a self-righteous and priestly mob of placemen dogged His steps, and finally brought about His betrayal and cruel death; but His home, the men and women around whom His natural affections were entwined, the little children who stopped their play to gaze lovingly as He passed, were familiar to Him in that little district.

At first the Homeland of Jesus appears marvellously small, and somewhat insignificant, compared with the uses

to which it was set apart in the working out of our redemption : but it grows upon us in wealth of human interest, and as it unfolds associations sacred and heroic, we become convinced of the Divine fitness of the scene to the circumstances by which it was consecrated.

The long low wall of mountains stretching out into the sea, in a north-westerly direction, is Carmel, the vineyard of the LORD. "The excellency of Carmel" is not a thing of the past. Its wooded slopes and jutting promontory retain their verdure throughout the entire summer.

The Carmel range bounded the south-western horizon of Jesus during His early years. Every morning He looked into its sun-lit glades, and as every day drew to its close He saw the purple shadows drawn up its sides, as the sun sank in fire behind its crest. The name Jebel Mar Elias, Mount of Saint Elijah, kept fresh in the memory of boy and man the signal victory gained by the prophet of the Lord over the priests of Baal. As He stood by the door of His early home He could mark the spot associated with David and Abigail, and the track across the plain by which the Shunammite woman sped to the house of Elisha.

Nearer by the breadth of the plain of Esdraelon rises the hill of Nazareth, whose thymy declivities were often trod by the feet of Jesus. Shoeless as a boy He many a time traversed the path over the eastern shoulder of the hill, on errands to Kana and Sephoris, and at its further base lay the town in which He grew in mind and stature. In that Nazareth home He was subject to His parents. There He learned village carpentry, and by the side of Joseph worked on the common utensils that were needed by the Galilean hamlet. There His hands constructed ploughs, and sharpened ox-goads, and made easy yokes for oxen before He linked those simple agricultural instruments with the deep lessons of Christian life. There in the daily discharge of pressing duties He lightened the burdens of a mechanic's

home, and while doing the work that came to hand, set an example of holy living. Daily He saw weary and heavy-laden men returning from their field labour. Hour by hour He saw the maids and matrons with pitchers on their shoulders toiling to and from the fountain for the perishable water. With the gathering shades He marked the sheep and goats that had grazed together during the day separating and filing off to their distinct folds. Amid the rough and homely surroundings of Nazareth, the simple objects that unfolded to His sight were pictures of Divine things, and gave point to the lessons which He taught. With our yoke pressing upon Him, He passed amid the corruptions around Him unsullied as a sunbeam, until His turbulent neighbours, feeling the reproach of His blameless life, and failing to apprehend the spirituality of His doctrines, drove Him from the home of His childhood.

Eastward from Nazareth stands the cone of Mount Tabor, down the sides of which Deborah, the bee, descended with her swarm of warriors, and routed the hosts of Sisera. Tabor used to be considered the Mount of Transfiguration, but as its top was covered with houses and fortifications in the time of our Lord, the identification has been generally given up in favour of Hermon, which fits in much better with the circumstances of the event.

Beyond Tabor, in the line of Deborah's march, lie Endor and Shunem and Nain, with their dismal and joyous memories, and beyond in the distance are the wave-like hills of Gilboa, where the leal-hearted Jonathan and his father fell.

About half way between Tabor and our standpoint, but a little to the east, rise the jagged horns of Hattin, the traditional Mount of Beatitudes. On one of those arid elevations Jesus sat and spoke to the hungry and thirsty crowd of the spiritual hunger and thirst which have in themselves the earnest of the blessing.

That rugged brown mountain is the Sinai of the Gospel. On one of its commanding peaks our blessed LORD unfolded the laws and principles of His kingdom for all lands, and for all time. The seed was sown on the beaten pathway, and perhaps it was never more ruthlessly trampled on than on the Mount of Beatitudes itself.

On the very spot where Jesus promised fulness of blessing to "the poor in spirit," the proudest spirits of Christendom assembled and fought, professedly for Christ, with weapons that were not of His kingdom.

A little over seven hundred years ago King Guy de Lusignan and his demoralized crusaders held those heights. Salah ed-Dîn, the flower of Moslem chivalry, the Saladin of romance, hemmed them in with blazing forests, and a circle of eighty thousand Saracens. The Crusaders, hungry and thirsty, and shut in by a sea of flame, awaited the enemy among the rocks that heard the Sermon on the Mount. The fiery hosts of Saladin surged up those slopes like a rising tide, ebbing and flowing, but still rising higher and higher, until they swept in triumph over the summit. Then among those hot rocks, on that July morning, there was a short fierce struggle, and the cross of the Crusader went down before the crescent of Islam, for they who had taken the sword contrary to the law of the Gospel had perished by the sword according to the warning of the Gospel. The mount is now a Golgotha.

From the Mount of Beatitudes the eye wanders to the sea of Galilee, the fairest object in the whole landscape. It lies more than three thousand feet below our standpoint. The lake, which appears to be an irregular oval, seems very near, and very small, though it is some sixteen miles long by six broad, and is distant nine or ten miles.

Apart from all sacred associations there is something wonderfully striking and supremely beautiful in the sea of Gennesaret, so deep among the hills, so still and silent, so

hemmed about by rolling tablelands and furrowed ridges, like a shining mirror set in a rigid framework of purple mountains.

Down by the western shore of that lovely sheet of water Jesus spent the years of His manhood. That solitude, lighted up by the golden glow of evening, was then a centre of population. The Greek and the Roman were there, and their flatterers and ministers. One Herod built Tiberias, the only inhabited town now on the lake, and foundations which extend far beyond the limits of the present town give evidence of the splendid monument which he dedicated to his abominable patron. Another Herod built Julias at the north-east corner of the lake, in honour of the profligate daughter of Augustus. Chorazin, Capernaum, and Bethsaida, in the neighbourhood, were cities exalted up to heaven, and by the suburbs of those splendid cities and along the shore there were Roman villas, and the costly mansions of rich Galileans who imitated the luxurious habits of their masters. And Arabs were there with their "ships of the desert," to exchange the products of East and West by the shortest route to India. A Roman road ran from the lower end of Gennesaret, past Bosra and Sulkhâd, direct to the Persian Gulf, and the road remains to this day an abiding witness to the energy of the Empire.

In the days of Jesus the lake swarmed with boats, carrying and distributing merchandise among the cities on its margin, and the phosphorescent flash from many oars showed that the fishermen were reaping the harvest of the sea for the dwellers by its shore. The precipitous eastern coast, rising from lake to tableland, is "the country of Gadarenes over against Galilee," and the herds of swine that fed on its declivities prove the presence of a large Gentile population, for neither Jew nor Arab partook of the flesh of swine.

In that busy throng, and among the multitudinous

peoples who met by the lake, Jesus passed the years of His manhood. His life down there was summed up in five words: "He went about doing good." In healing diseases and relieving distress generally He acted from sympathy with pain and human weakness, and though His aim was not to astonish the crowd, His doings were so far above the ordinary course of things as infallibly to show the hand of God at work among His own forces.

He fed the five thousand on the grassy sward, at the north-east corner of the sea of Galilee, because "He had compassion on the multitude."

When the leper whose bodily disease was the type of sin and ruin in the soul came kneeling to Him, "Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth His hand and touched him, and saith unto him, I will, be thou clean." At another time, "Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and He healed their sick."

Nor did Jesus after His resurrection cease to put forth His superhuman power on behalf of His people. He watched His disciples toiling all night, in faith, on Genesaret, and catching nothing, doing their duty uncheered by success; and, in the morning glow, the voice that once stilled the tempest sounded across the waves in accents of tenderness, "Children, have ye any meat?" Then in following His directions they secured a great draught of fishes, and thereby enjoyed a foretaste of success in the great work of catching men. Nor did His love stop short at vouchsafed success. The ruddy fire and ready meal showed His care for the common wants of weary and hungry men.

A thousand memories crowd upon us as we gaze and gaze on the placid lake. There He called twelve unlearned and uninfluential peasants to follow Him, and they overthrew the temples of idolatry, and set up the kingdom of

Christ on the ruins. Down there He cast His lot among the industrious poor, the salt of whose life was honest, manly toil. The labourers in every field, and the women at every well, and the children at play down there all knew Him. That lake side was the loved home of His manhood. He taught by its rippling shore. He walked over its submissive waves. He spoke the dialect of the district, and the common objects that lay about Him became signs and symbols by which He communicated His message to all men. His Gospel speaks to man in forms of speech which had their natural birth by the shores of that peaceful lake. The customs of the district are woven into its texture. Its physical roots are in the homely phraseology of Capernaum and Bethsaida. The thoughts that guide our lives, and stir our hearts, and kindle our spirits into life and consciousness, took form and substance in the homeland of Jesus.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR RAMSAY.

IN the EXPOSITOR, September, 1896, pp. 194-201, Dr. Ramsay has called attention to an inscription found in old Carnuntum, in Pannonia (on the Danube below Vienna), in which an "Italic cohort" is mentioned. The inscription makes it probable, as Dr. Ramsay points out, that about 69 A.D. an "Italic cohort" was stationed in Syria. For this information I am very thankful, and I could contemplate the fact with an undisturbed joy. But Dr. Ramsay has for some time felt, and still feels, the need of refuting me on every possible occasion, and now this new find has stirred up anew his zeal for refutation. He thinks (p. 194) that the newly found inscription "will probably be held by most scholars as a sufficient proof that, in our present state of knowledge, the verdict of Dr. Schürer is

contrary to the evidence." I had asserted, namely, that under the Jewish king Agrippa (41–44 A.D.) an "Italic (*i.e.* composed of Roman citizens) cohort" could not have served in Cæsarea, and that this was improbable also for the period before 41, because the garrison of Cæsarea before the time of Agrippa was probably made up of the same troops as after his time, namely, of native Cæsarean and Sebastenian troops.¹ Now what does the inscription prove? (1) It proves that at the time to which the inscription refers, an Italic cohort was stationed in Syria to be sure, but as to Cæsarea—the garrison of which is the point at issue—the inscription is silent. (2) It refers not to the time before 41, nor to the time 44–66, but, as Ramsay himself holds, to the year 69 A.D. The inscription, therefore, proves absolutely nothing against my positions, and Dr. Ramsay, moreover, in his zeal has entirely forgotten to say *in how far* it could prove anything against me. What he introduces into his article besides this, consists of nothing but confident assertions and personal affronts.

I could therefore close here, had he not brought into the field against me the authority of Mommsen. He says, p. 197, "Dr. Schürer argues that even between A.D. 6 and 41 . . . an Italic cohort cannot have been stationed at Cæsarea." This assertion he bases on a series of conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judæa during these years. It is fortunately unnecessary for me to discuss his conjectures; I need only point out (1) that they are in conscious and direct contradiction to the principles laid down by Mommsen, the supreme authority on the subject; (2) that Mommsen has now considered them and judged them to be "erroneous in every respect."

¹ *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i. 386. The English translation (First Division, vol. ii. p. 54) is here wrong. Instead of "in reference to a later period" it should read, "in reference to the preceding period."

To this I make the following reply:—(1) It is an error to say that I said: “between A.D. 6 and 41 an Italic cohort *cannot* have been stationed at Cæsarea.” I said only that it was not probable (*nicht wahrscheinlich*). (2) It is untrue that Mommsen pronounced the above quoted hard judgment upon my “conjectures as to the Roman forces stationed in Judæa during these years.” Mommsen’s words have reference only to what I said about the *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή*.¹ In giving Mommsen’s judgment a more general reference, Dr. Ramsay makes an entirely incorrect interpretation of that judgment. (3) Even Mommsen himself has in this case proceeded incautiously. He says my opinion is “erroneous in every respect.” In reality, my opinion differs from his in but one single point. He thinks that, among the five cohorts which formed the garrison of Cæsarea from 44–66 A.D., there were found one *cohors Ascalonitarum* and one *cohors Canathenorum*. I consider this impossible, because Josephus says positively that the troops at that time garrisoned in Cæsarea were for the most part Cæsareans and Sebastenians (Jos., *Antiq.*, xx. 8, 7: μέγα φρονούντες ἐπὶ τῷ τοὺς πλείστους τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐκείσε [al. Ῥωμαίους ἐκεῖ] στρατευομένων Καισαρεῖς εἶναι καὶ Σεβαστηνοὺς; cf. also xix. 9, 1–2). Since, on the other hand, there are no positive grounds for Mommsen’s opinion, I must hold to my own opinion even against his authority, and this too, all the more, inasmuch as it has been hitherto the usual opinion. But, be that as it may, there exists otherwise no differences of opinion between us worthy of mention. For as to what Mommsen further brings up against me in supposed polemic, that the adjective *Σεβαστή* is equivalent to Augusta, and that the meaning of it is, not that those troops came from Sebaste (were

¹ *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1895, p. 501: “Was Schürer über die *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή* der Apostelgeschichte ausführt erscheint mir in jeder Hinsicht verfehlt.”

Σεβαστηνοί), I can only remark that for more than twenty years (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1875, pp. 416-419; *Geschichte*, i. 385) I have advocated as positively as Mommsen the first view, and have combated the last; that is to say, I have affirmed exactly the same thing that Mommsen affirmed. And so it is only an inadvertence when he directs this polemic against me, and on the strength of it says my opinion is "erroneous in every respect." Dr. Ramsay would have done better had he corrected the oversight of the eminent scholar, instead of taking up, as he does, the judgment against me based on that oversight, and proceeding, as he does, to make a big story out of it.

E. SCHÜRER.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. J. Barmby, M.A.	
The Meaning of "Righteousness of God" in the Epistle to the Romans	124
Rev. W. E. Barnes, D.D.	
The Midrashic Element in Chronicles	426
Rev. Thomas Barns, M.A.	
The Apostolic Conference at Jerusalem: a Study in Chronology and Criticism	298
Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, M.A.	
Some Recent Old Testament Literature	73, 154
Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke :	
VII. The Escapes of Jesus	27
VIII. Your Father Who is in Heaven	99
IX. The Worth of Man	212
Rev. Henry Burton, M.A.	
The Son of Man	388
F. C. Conybeare, M.A.	
Ananias of Shirak upon Christmas	321
Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D., LL.D.	
The Sacrifice of Isaac	16
The Intercession of the Spirit	186
The Place of Abraham in Religious History	338
Sir J. William Dawson, C.M.G., F.R.S.	
Sons of God and Daughters of Men	201

	PAGE
Rev. James Denney, D.D.	
The Dissolution of Religion	263
Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D.	
Christ's Attitude to His Own Death	277, 414
Rev. E. H. Gifford, D.D.	
The Incarnation: a Study of Philippians ii. 5-11	161, 241
Rev. W. R. Inge, M.A.	
The Mystical Element in St. Paul's Theology	114
Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A.	
The Derivation of Purim	151
Rev. Prof. E. König, D.D.	
The History and Method of Pentateuchal Criticism	81
Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, M.A.	
Observations on the Fragment of Ecclesiasticus edited by Mr. Schechter	140
Rev. E. Medley, B.A.	
A Conception of Christ Suggested to a Heathen Inquirer by Paul's Earliest Extant Writing: a Study in 1 Thessalonians	359
Rev. W. W. Peyton, M.A.	
Vicarious Heredity: a Reading of the Child Massacre in Bethlehem	440
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
Paul's Attitude towards Peter and James	43
Cornelius and the Italic Cohort	194
Rev. D. M. Ross, M.A.	
"The Mind of the Master"	228
Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D.	
Paul's Attitude towards Peter and James	56
S. Schechter, M.A.	
A Fragment of the Original Text of Ecclesiasticus	1
Rev. Professor E. Schürer, D.D.	
Reply to Professor Ramsay	469

Rev. Professor George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D.	
Buhl's New Geography of Palestine, and Certain Geographical Problems	401
Rev. John Thomas, M.A.	
"Double for all her Sins": a Critical Exposition	370
Julia Wedgwood.	
Fenton John Anthony Hort	309
Rev. Preb. B. Whitefoord, M.A.	
Aside from the Multitude: a Study in St. Mark vii. 33	380
Rev. R. Winterbotham, M.A.	
"The Shortenings of the Days"	65
The Cultus of Father Abraham	177
Rev. William Wright, D.D.	
The Rivers of Damascus: Abana and Pharpar	290
Hermon	351
The Homeland of Jesus	461

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i. 1-11	94	Job iv. 7	105
v. 5.	93	xii. 1	351
vi. 1	201	Psalms ii. 7	96
xviii. 19	338	xxvi.	127
xxii. 1	16	xxxix. 5	111
xxii. 14	84	ciii. 10	104
xxxvi. 31	83	Isaiah ii. 2-5	79
Exodus xii. 41	92	xv.	157
Leviticus xvii. 12	302	xxx. 9	91
xxvii. 24	332	xxxvi.	89
Numbers xxi. 14	87	xl. 1	370
xxii.	82	li. 5-8	127
xxiv.	82	lx. 17	69
Deuteronomy iii. 8.	351	Jeremiah vii. 13	90
xvi. 16	332	Lamentations i. 4	92
xxxi. 26	82	Ezekiel iv. 9	91
xxxiv. 5	83	Daniel xii. 13	92
2 Kings v. 12	290	Hosea i. 2	76
xvii. 4	73	xii. 12-24	75
xviii. 13	89	Amos ii. 4, 5	78
1 Chronicles v. 23	352	v. 26	73
Ezra vii. 11	85	Micah v. 5-15	74

	PAGE		PAGE
Micah vi. 9	74	Luke ix. 57	218
Zechariah ix. 11	157	xiv. 5	213
Malachi i. 6	101	xx. 45-47	263
Matthew iv. 10	289	xxiv. 26	72
v. 9	156	John i. 29	277
vi. 25	109	vi. 15	34
vi. 26	212	xix. 28	70
viii. 19	218	Acts ii. 22	280
x. 31	212	xi.	194
xii. 1-8	221	xi. 20	60
xii. 12	213	xi. 29	298
xii. 38-40	263	xiii. 8-12	62
xiii. 55	393	xiii. 14	58
xv. 5	221	xv.	43
xv. 13	109	Romans i. 14	114
xvi. 1	40	iii. 25	277
xvi. 6	41	v. 18	136
xvi. 13	39	vi. 6-11	119
xvi. 26	212	viii. 7	121
xviii. 7	216	viii. 18-23	186
xix. 5	205	xii. 6	51
xxii. 42	221	xiv. 5	123
xxiii.	263	1 Corinthians ii. 1-16	118
xxiii. 7	221	v. 7	277
xxiv. 22	65	vi. 12	121
xxv. 31	227	ix. 9	213
xxvi. 32	66	ix. 16	122
Mark ii. 5	286	ix. 20	121
iii. 13	28	ix. 27	120
iv. 10	32	xii. 4	51
iv. 35	31	xv. 3	281
vi. 31	34	xv. 24	136
vi. 33	34	2 Corinthians v. 1-14	122
vi. 45	34	xii. 1-4	119
vii. 24	36	Galatians i. 12	118
vii. 33	37	i. 16	48
vii. 33	380	ii. 1-10	43
viii. 11	40	ii. 6	58
viii. 15	41	ii. 7	308
viii. 27	39	ii. 9	46
ix. 30	27	Ephesians i. 9	156
ix. 31	40	Philippians ii. 5-11	161
x. 17	222	ii. 5-11	241
xii. 28	223	Colossians i. 15-17	119
xvi. 7	66	iii. 10	119
Luke vi. 35	156	1 Thessalonians v. 23	121
vii. 47	286	1 Timothy v. 17	378
viii. 1-3	219	Hebrews ix. 26	277
ix. 18	39	xiii. 8	277

